S. HRG. 101-1244

NATIONAL TREE TRUST ACT OF 1990—S. 2426

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2426

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO DESIGNATE A PRIVATE NONPROFIT FOUNDATION AS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTING COMMUNITY TREE PLANTING AND CULTIVATION PROJECTS, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO ESTABLISH A RURAL TREE PLANTING PROGRAM AND A COMMUNITY TREE PLANTING PROGRAM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 24, 1990

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

42-186 == WASHINGTON : 1991

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-035345-9

9/10

S161-29.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont, *Chairman*

DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
DAVID L. BOREN, Oklahoma
HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
KENT CONRAD, North Dakota
WYCHE FOWLER, JR., Georgia
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
MAX BAUCUS, Montana
J. ROBERT KERREY, Nebraska

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
CHRISTOPHER S. "KIT" BOND, Missouri
PETE WILSON, California
SLADE GORTON, Washington

CHARLES RIEMENSCHNEIDER, *Staff Director*
JAMES M. CUBIE, *Chief Counsel*
CHRISTINE SARCONE, *Chief Clerk*
CHARLES CONNER, *Staff Director for the Minority*

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held on: July 24, 1990 1

NATIONAL TREE TRUST ACT OF 1990—S. 2426

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1990

Kerrey, Hon. J. Robert, a U.S. Senator from Nebraska 1
Prepared statement 2

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Domenici, Hon. Pete V., a U.S. Senator from New Mexico 3
Prepared statement 4
Kearney, Patricia M., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC; accompanied by Allan J. West, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, and Tony Dorrell, Director of Cooperative Forestry 7
Prepared statement 11
Evans, John L., Deputy Assistant Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, letter of with enclosure, dated September 18, 1990, to Hon. Patrick J. Leahy 81
USDA response to questions submitted by Senator J. Robert Kerrey regarding S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990" 82
Crow, Trammell, chairman and founding partner, Trammell Crow Co., Dallas, TX 18
Prepared statement 20
Sampson, R. Neil, executive vice president, the American Forestry Association, Washington, DC 28
Prepared statement 32
Butler, Sydney J., vice president of conservation, The Wilderness Society, Washington, DC 37
Prepared statement 38
Hubbard, James E., president, the National Association of State Foresters, Washington, DC 39
Prepared statement 43
Scovotto, Lawrence, executive vice-president, American Association of Nurserymen, Washington, DC 47
Prepared statement 49
Wiseman, Laurence, president, American Forest Council, Washington, DC 54
Prepared statement 58
Joint Resolution Addressing the Stewardship Initiative 66
S. 2426, National Tree Trust Act of 1990, reprint of 87

NATIONAL TREE TRUST ACT OF 1990—S. 2426

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1990

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room SR-332, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Patrick J. Leahy (chairman of the committee), Hon. J. Robert Kerrey, presiding.

Present or submitting a statement: Senators Kerrey and Gorton.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. ROBERT KERREY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Senator KERREY. The meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will now come to order.

The purpose of the meeting today is to hear testimony on S. 2426, the National Tree Trust Act of 1990. The central component of this particular piece of legislation is the President's "America the Beautiful Program," and sets the ambitious and worthy goal of planting 1 billion trees annually over the next 5 years.

I wish to make it clear at the outset that my interest does intersect with the administration. The desire to plant more trees in America is a worthy objective and one, I believe, deserving of all of our support.

However, the concerns that I have expressed in the past are several:

One, I am concerned about the expenditure of taxpayer dollars. There has been a considerable amount of debate, particularly inside the Agriculture Committee, as we try to craft a farm bill that stays within the budget limitations that have been set down by the administration.

We are still struggling to get crop insurance in, for example, and there will be a considerable amount of acrimonious debate, I am quite certain, not only as to how to put that particular program together but where to get the money in order to fund it. So there is a funding question, and a need, I believe, to exert oversight, particularly when you're talking about new programs.

The second concern that I have, and I just say it as directly and clearly as possible, is I am not certain as to the administration's goals. I understand 1 billion trees a year. That is a big number. I do not know how many acres that plants. I do not know what that accomplishes over the 5-year program. I do not know where it is that we are going. Are we trying to get to no net loss of forestry? Are we trying to replace a specific number of acres that we are losing every year? Is there an objective, in other words, inside this

program other than just a numerical objective of planting 1 billion trees a year?

I think it is very important to have that objective, by the way, because there is increasing amounts of concern, not only for the loss of old growth, but loss of forest throughout the world as well as in the United States. The United States, I think, needs to be able to stand upon fairly high principle as it talks to nations like Brazil and other nations in Latin America out of concern for loss of forestry that is a fundamental building block for life on this planet.

Third, I just say in general, and I would just like to hear about some other alternatives that perhaps were explored to carry out the objectives that the administration would like to accomplish. Having said that, I have a full prepared statement that I will insert and give unanimous consent to include in the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kerrey follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. J. ROBERT KERREY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry meets this morning to review S. 2426, "The National Tree Trust Act of 1990." This bill is the central component of the President's "America the Beautiful Program," and sets the ambitious goal of planting 1 billion trees *annually* over the next 5 years.

I wish to make clear at the outset that I like trees and I believe that we as a Nation should be planting more of them. For these reasons I support the goal of the legislation.

However, I believe this hearing is necessary to satisfy taxpayers that their money will be well spent and that, more fundamentally, the proposed expenditures are warranted even as Congress and the executive branch struggle over how to come to grips with projected annual budget deficits well in excess of $200 billion.

Forestry and tree planting programs have suffered sharp cutbacks during the last decade. Funding for State and private forestry management programs have been reduced by 91 percent over the last 10 years. While I welcome this administration's desire to reverse that course, I want to learn more about how this money may be spent.

At the same time I am concerned that in launching this initiative, we do not neglect already established programs. Such programs, if properly funded, may be better vehicles for attaining the goals established by this legislation. Further, I have a number of broader questions about forestry policy that I will address to the witnesses.

The Tree Trust proposal, as I understand it, calls for spending $175 million to plant trees. Of this total, apparently $47 million would come from existing programs. But fully $128 million would be "new money."

The administration's ability to find at least $128 million in additional funds to plant trees would appear to be in conflict with Secretary Yeutter's 13-page letter to the Senate last week in which he threatened to recommend a veto of the Senate farm bill if the farm bill "were sent to the President prior to the conclusion of the budget summit and does not achieve substantial, multi-year savings from the current Mid-Session Review estimate of program costs . . ."

I am interested in learning from the administration witnesses today just why our tree planting efforts should not be held to the same belt-tightening standard that apparently is being applied to the farm bill and Government spending generally. What is it about trees that warrants preferential treatment? And why should this Tree Trust proposal be exempt from our efforts to resolve what Secretary Yeutter 1 week ago called our "current budget crisis?"

At this point I would like to turn to welcome those who have come to testify and I will have additional questions to bring up with our witnesses.

Senator KERREY. At this time, we will move to the witnesses. We have a very good panel of witnesses. I see that we also have Senator Domenici here. Out of respect for what is, I am sure, a busy schedule and with a request for indulgence on the other witnesses, I would welcome Senator Domenici from New Mexico this morning. I understand that you have a particular piece of legislation you are

concerned about, and I would simply ask you to come forward and present it.

STATEMENT OF HON. PETE V. DOMENICI, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I just sit here?

Senator KERREY. Sure.

Senator DOMENICI. I appreciate it. I have sat in most of these rooms, but I do not come to this one very often. It is almost as good looking at the Armed Services Committee.

Senator KERREY. Much quieter than your Budget Committee hearing room.

Senator DOMENICI. Mr. Chairman, I will take just a tiny bit of your time and that of the committee's. I do not offer my suggestion in lieu of or as a substitution for the President's proposal, but I have introduced a piece of legislation called the National Forest Foundation Act (S. 2385). I think you are well aware that we have been rather successful in the United States in chartering out of Congress some foundations where the Government puts up seed money for and establishes the parameters for their activities, and then they proceed with various charitable and private contributions to accomplish their goals. We have one for the parks called the National Park Foundation. We have one for wildlife. I think its title is the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, or perhaps it has another couple of names with it, but essentially that is it.

This concept first came to me from a former legislative fellow who worked for the Forest Service for a long time. As he was leaving, he said it may be time to talk about a National Forest Foundation Act. And essentially what I have introduced, and it has about 8 or 10 cosponsors, and I believe they are rather substantial Members of this institution, it is Senate Bill 2385. This is perhaps complementary to the American Tree Trust Act. Maybe it can stand on its own. It shares some of the same goals, but it differs in two very, very important ways. This National Forest Foundation is oriented to multiple use, not just tree planting. The National Forest Foundation would benefit our national forests and grasslands, not private lands in urban areas.

Now I am not suggesting that one is more important than the other, merely telling you the difference. Our national forest lands hold some of America's greatest assets. They have major environmental, economic and social significance to millions of Americans, and you know the kind of areas, diverse in nature, that are included within our forests. They are national treasures and clearly we need to protect them and thus protect our environment. This national charitable foundation which we would set up, and I need not burden the chairman with how it is structured. It has a typical board of directors. Some of them are at large from the public sector. It would be a charitable, nonprofit corporation established to conduct and encourage educational and other activities that support land management, research, cooperation and cooperative programs in the forests.

I think it is a superb vehicle to promote cooperative efforts between the private sector and the Forest Service. Fish and wildlife habitat restoration, environmental education, cultural resources protection, research, riparian area restoration and creative grazing management, are only a few of the projects that could be undertaken. I am convinced that there are thousands, thousands of concerned citizens and organizations concerned in the area of conservation, recreation and the industry that stand ready to share their talents and resources to benefit our national forests in the broad manner that I have just described.

This Foundation would be a catalyst for developing cooperative relationships among these groups and the Forest Service. My proposal would have a 15 member board, $500,000 per year for the first 2 years for startup, and then $1 million for the next 5 years, provided there is an equal amount of private sector match. Frankly, I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that when the bill was introduced, the enthusiasm that was exhibited by groups like Ducks Unlimited, the Elk Foundation, Trout Unlimited, National Wild Turkey Federation, and literally scores of organizations of that type that came to the announcement saying they thought this was a very meritorious approach to conservation and protection of our environment. I am convinced that if we chartered it, it would indeed gain broad support and would have a very salutary effect on our forest, thus, in a sense, on our trees, which is the basic subject matter before the committee.

I thank you very much. I have a more detailed statement that goes into the background and how this came about, the kind of support it has, and I would ask that you make it a part of the record.

Senator KERREY. Without objection.

[The prepared statement of Senator Domenici follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PETE V. DOMENICI, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing today on the National Tree Trust Act and for allowing me to testify before the committee in support of my bill to establish the National Forest Foundation, S. 2385.

On April 5, Senators Leahy and Lugar introduced S. 2426, the American Tree Trust Act to implement a National Tree Planting and Forest Improvement Program as part of the President's "America the Beautiful" initiative.

It includes two basic components to be administered by the Department of Agriculture, a Rural Forestry component for reforestation of private lands and a Community Tree Planting component.

The Community Tree Planting component authorizes the President to designate a private, nonprofit Foundation to:

(1) Promote volunteerism for community tree planting;

(2) Solicit private contributions; and

(3) Accept and administer gifts and make grants to encourage tree planting in communities and urban environments.

It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to grant $35 million to the Foundation in fiscal year 1991 from appropriated funds for startup costs.

The Foundation proposed in the American Tree Trust Act is an idea worthy of our careful consideration. It provides a focal point for promoting volunteerism to plant billions of trees throughout America on private lands and in our communities. This is a worthy goal that I support.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also call your attention to S. 2385, the National Forest Foundation Act. I introduced the National Forest Foundation Act on March 30, 1990, and it was referred to this committee.

My National Forest Foundation bill is a perfect complement to the American Tree Trust Act being considered before your committee today.

The National Forest Foundation would bring together the talents and resources of the private sector and the U.S. Forest Service and funnel those resources into worthwhile projects on our national forests and grasslands.

The National Forest Foundation would have a broad, multiple-use focus and be established to enhance publicly owned resources on our national forest lands.

Mr. Chairman, much of America's greatness lies within our national forests and grasslands.

Vast stretches of our land—8 percent, in fact, of America—is land within the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. These lands are found in 44 of our 50 States, and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

These lands are spectacular areas of rugged mountains, prairies, trout streams, and wilderness. They are lands providing resources for America's economic greatness.

Some of my most cherished memories come from a special place in my home State of New Mexico, the Cibola National Forest. When my children were younger, we often visited Las Huertas Canyon.

We enjoyed the drive, spending afternoons together in the mountains. I still carry fond memories of the shaded stream, picnics, and the drive around the north end of the mountain with a car full of children.

The American people not only want the Federal Government to protect this resource, but I am convinced they want to participate personally in protecting and improving our forests.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I introduced legislation to establish the National Forest Foundation.

The National Forest Foundation would bring together the talents and resources of the private sector with those in the Forest Service to enhance the multiple-use management of our national forests and grasslands.

This legislation would establish a charitable, nonprofit corporation to raise and direct money and other resources into our national forests and grasslands. The Foundation will funnel private donations for projects to rehabilitate and enhance the natural and cultural resources on the national forests.

These donations will be used to complement ongoing Federal efforts. For instance, they could be used to protect and interpret archaeological sites, clean up visitor areas, develop and maintain trails, and plant trees.

Specifically, the Foundation would:

(1) Encourage, accept, and administer private gifts of money and property to benefit the services and activities of the U.S. Forest Service;

(2) Undertake and conduct activities to enhance the on-the-ground management and enjoyment of lands in our National Forest System;

(3) Conduct and encourage educational, technical, and other activities that support multiple-use management, research, cooperative forestry, and other Forest Service programs; and

(4) Promote cooperation among the Forest Service, the private sector, conservation organizations, educational institutions, and the general public.

Mr. Chairman, I see this bill as a perfect complement to the President's "America the Beautiful" initiative. The President's initiative proposes, among other things, a reforestation program to plant more than 1 billion trees per year on private lands and in communities across America.

My bill shares many of the same goals. What "America the Beautiful" would do for private forested lands and communities, the National Forest Foundation would accomplish for our national forests and grasslands, using the assistance and resources of the private sector.

Achieving balanced management of America's resources requires cooperation. It requires comprehensive planning as well as sensitive administration and wise use.

The Foundation would provide a means for the private sector to actively participate in numerous projects such as buying and developing habitat for improvement, recreation development, restoring and understanding our cultural heritage, returning a riparian area to health, management, research, reforestation, and educational programs.

Mr. Chairman, this concept first came to me from a former legislative fellow on my staff, a man who had served as a District Forest Ranger in New Mexico. Like most public land managers, he was faced with the difficult task of meeting public demands for enjoyment of the national forests, while working within limited budgets.

In seeking to reconcile these differences, he discovered the willingness of individuals and private organizations to provide their talent and resources to accomplish worthwhile projects that never were funded.

So the National Forest Foundation will provide a vehicle to facilitate that kind of cooperation, cooperation between the private sector and the Forest Service.

Under my bill, the Foundation would be governed by a 15-member Board of Directors appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Chief of the Forest Service would serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member.

Through its Board of Directors—consisting of trained and experienced professionals in natural resource management, law, or research—the National Forest Foundation would provide a broad and diverse multiple-use focus to a great variety of projects of interest to all Americans. Board members would serve without pay, but could be reimbursed for expenses.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Foundation $500,000 per year during the initial 2 years of the act. This would be startup money.

Further, the Secretary is authorized to provide up to $1 million per year for 5 years in funds, on a 1-for-1 basis, to match private contributions.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would note that two other foundations have been successful in accomplishing very specific and, in many ways, similar goals to the National Forest Foundation. These are the National Parks Foundation and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

These foundations have been very successful in bringing the private sector together with the public land managers to protect and enhance our public resources.

While developing this bill, I had the pleasure of talking with numerous conservation organizations, recreation associations, industry, and concerned citizens. Some are already forming partnerships with the Forest Service to further the cause of natural resources conservation. Thousands of Americans stand ready to share their talents and resources for the benefit of our national forests.

I see the National Forest Foundation as the catalyst for developing these cooperative relationships with private conservation organizations, industry, the academic community, and the philanthropic community to meet the multiple-use objectives of our national forests and grasslands.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for all Americans to get involved in the management and enjoyment of our national forests. We can begin that process by enacting S. 2385 to establish the National Forest Foundation.

I hope that the committee will consider this bill as you work on the important measures before you.

Senator KERREY. Senator, you said there were two differences between your Foundation and the other proposal. One was that it was on national parkland only and not private land. What was the other?

Senator DOMENICI. The other was multiple use.

Senator KERREY. OK.

Senator DOMENICI. Not just tree planting.

Senator KERREY. I thank you very much.

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Gorton, even though you did not say anything.

Senator KERREY. Do you have an opening statement you would like to make before Senator Domenici leaves?

Senator GORTON. I timed my arrival very well, did I not, Senator? No opening statement.

Senator KERREY. We will move to the first panel. The first panel is Ms. Patricia Kearney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for National Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and Mr. Trammell Crow, chairman and the founding partner of the Trammel Crow Company in Dallas, Texas. We have some name tags, if you want to just come on down here.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA M. KEARNEY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, DC; ACCOMPANIED BY ALLAN J. WEST, DEPUTY CHIEF, STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY, AND TONY DORRELL, DIRECTOR OF COOPERATIVE FORESTRY

INTRODUCTION

Ms. KEARNEY. Thank you, Senator Kerrey, and thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the administration regarding S. 2426, the National Tree Trust Act of 1990.

I am accompanied by Al West, who is Deputy Chief of State and Private Forestry, and Tony Dorrell, who is the Director of Cooperative Forestry.

I would request that my testimony be submitted for the record, and I would like to summarize the comments, if I may.

Senator KERREY. Without objection.

PRESIDENT BUSH SENT HIS PROPOSAL FOR THE NATIONAL TREE TRUST ACT OF 1990 ON MARCH 22

Ms. KEARNEY. On March 22, President Bush sent his proposal for the National Tree Trust Act of 1990 to the Congress. We are very pleased that Chairman Leahy and Senator Lugar along with 27 cosponsors, including the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, introduced this important legislation.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

I would like to begin my comments by just quoting a brief passage that was in the President's transmittal letter that I think expresses the overall intent and philosophy of what he is trying to achieve with this Presidential initiative.

He said that:

> Enactment of this proposal will permit us to harness the efforts of individuals and organizations to undertake the nationwide planting and cultivation of invaluable trees. The prompt passage of this proposal [S. 2426] by the Congress will demonstrate our shared commitment to preserving one of our most valuable natural resources, our precious heritage of trees. Let us ensure that descendants will be able to share our pride in referring to this land as "America the Beautiful."

FAVORABLE COMMENTS

Since the President submitted his budget to the Congress in February, and since the submission of the legislation, we have experienced an overwhelming outpouring from both the general public and from many other groups. Some of these are traditionally involved with forestry issues and some are nontraditional groups that have come forward and said that this program made sense to them and that they wanted to participate in some way.

HOW THE PROGRAM WAS DEVELOPED TO REFLECT OUR BASIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Let me briefly describe the program in terms of how we developed it to reflect our basic goals and objectives. There are a couple of fundamental objectives. One was to see how we could plant the

most trees in the most cost effective manner. So that was one very key criteria that we had.

Another underscored the President's very firm philosophy that we should not create new bureaucracies. Instead, we should build upon the structures that are in place and that are working. We should try to emphasize those successes, support and fortify existing structures where possible in order to create a national movement and program. We definitely should build upon what was in existence both in the private and public sector.

And the third area was to look at where there was a real need as well as opportunities to viably plant the trees.

THE PROGRAM ITSELF WAS DIVIDED INTO TWO BASIC PARTS

The program itself was divided into two basic parts. One was what we call the rural component, which was really where we found that the maximum amount of land was available to plant trees on nonindustrial private land. And we believed we needed a program, therefore, that would target these lands. We looked at various options in terms of how to award incentives and promote tree planting on those areas. We concluded that the cost-share mechanism would be, in fact, the most cost effective method.

And so the program that the President proposed advocates a 50–50 cost-share system where half of the cost for planting and establishing the trees would be paid by the Federal Government and half of the costs would be paid by the private landowners. The organizational mechanism that we would use builds upon the professionals available within the Department of Agriculture. Essentially, what would happen, for example, is that a technical assistance team would be available comprised of a Forest Service representative, an ASCS representative who would help administer the program, a soil conservation representative, probably an extension representative, and then probably some State foresters and other key people. They would go out and work with the private landowner to determine what would be the best species for that parcel of land, how he best could establish the trees, and what his options are for planting trees on his land. Overall, the team would basically give him useful ideas and technical assistance.

Therefore, the program the President proposed would fulfil those goals of building on existing structures, planting trees because there is a need, and doing so in the most cost effective manner.

Second, on the community trees side, we also saw that there is a trend of deforestation within our cities and communities. Right now for about every four trees that are cut down or diseased, only one is replaced. There are many, many benefits from trees in the urban areas, and so we found that we really needed an intensive program to focus on urban forestry.

A LOT OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED

A lot of technical assistance is needed because there are very special needs in various regions and various cities. It is essential not only to plant these relatively expensive trees, but to maintain them and make sure that they are well established. So we looked to the State and Private Forestry network within the Forest Serv-

ice to carry out this function, because they have the largest cooperator network for technical assistance programs that are available. We felt it was highly appropriate to build on that structure for technical assistance.

PROPOSING A TOTALLY PRIVATE FOUNDATION TO HELP WITH SUPPORT

We knew it would be enormously expensive for the Federal Government to try to underwrite an entire program in urban areas. We felt that urban forestry is an area where the private sector is doing quite well in many cities, and many nonprofit foundations are doing an absolutely marvelous and outstanding job in planting trees in cities. This is why we are proposing a totally private Foundation that would be designated by the President that could establish a national network to support all of those great programs that are taking place on the ground and encourage many more of them to be duplicated, so the Foundation would basically be a facilitator. We also realized that if Federal funds were given as seed money, that money then could be leveraged to get this ball rolling much more rapidly by leveraging corporate dollars.

We have very good reason to believe that there is a lot of interest out there by corporations to become involved in tree planting. Quite a deal of money could be raised to foster the planting of trees in communities. These funds could easily be leveraged into other dollars and the benefits would multiply significantly by approaching the community program from a partnership perspective. These were the basic criteria underlying the development of the community program in our proposal.

REASONS FOR PLANTING TREES

Now, I would like to go on and just very briefly run through what we also saw were reasons why it is important for us to plant trees, and why this is an important environmental initiative.

As you know, the environmental issues, as we look to the future, are critical to all of us. When we can take preventive measures it can be much more cost effective than taking remedial actions. The President's program demonstrates the United States commitment to sustainable forest management, which has many benefits such as offsetting carbon dioxide emissions that can help reduce global warming. We need to do more research to find out exactly what is needed for complex concerns like global warming, but our proposal is something positive that we can put on the ground right now.

Other multiple environmental benefits including water quality, erosion control, and wildlife habitat to name a few. Obviously, aesthetic and scenic beauty are important, as are the economic benefits that go far beyond the forestry community. Obviously trees are a source of wood products, paper, lumber, et cetera, that need to be readily available. Forest based recreation is also an area where we see enormously increasing demands. Through tree planting more recreation could be developed. This type of development also helps rural economies diversify. And in the cities, trees provide economic benefits such as energy conservation. Strategically placed trees are of great benefit in terms of energy conservation. Some estimates show that over $4 billion could be saved in this country by urban

consumers on air-conditioning bills alone, by having more trees strategically placed around their homes and buildings.

CONCLUSION

Trees provide many more benefits, but I would like to just summarize now, again, with the President's statement. He said that "we have an opportunity to renew the environmental ethic in America and reassert U.S. leadership on environmental challenges around the world. Therefore, we strongly urge the Congress to enact S. 2426 as quickly as possible." We again appreciate Senator Leahy and Senator Lugar's interest and leadership in this initiative, and we thank you, Senator Kerrey, for holding this hearing today to give us the opportunity to discuss these issues further. Thank you.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Pat.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kearney follows:]

STATEMENT OF
PATRICIA M. KEARNEY
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
United States Senate

Concerning S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990"

July 24, 1990

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

Thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Administration regarding S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990."

I am accompanied by Allan J. West, Deputy Chief for State and Private Forestry and Tony Dorrell, Director of Cooperative Forestry.

On March 22, President Bush sent his proposed "National Tree Trust Act of 1990" to the Congress. This proposal is a key part of the President's "America the Beautiful" initiative. We are pleased Chairman Leahy and Senator Lugar, along with 27 cosponsors, including the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, introduced this important legislation.

The President stated in his letter of transmittal to Congress that, "Enactment of this proposal will permit us to harness the efforts of individuals and organizations to undertake the nationwide planting and cultivation of invaluable trees. The prompt passage of this proposal [S. 2426] by the Congrees will demonstrate our shared commitment to preserving one of our most valuable natural resources, our precious heritage of trees. Let us ensure that

descendants will be able to share our pride in referring to this land as "America the Beautiful."

We have been receiving overwhelming public support since the President's announcement of the tree planting initiative in his State of the Union Address. The White House and those of us in key positions at the Department of Agriculture have received numerous calls and letters of support. We have seen a tremendous amount of grassroots support agreeing with the need to begin planting trees and anxiously awaiting the signal to move ahead. People want to do something positive for their nation and the environment. America the Beautiful personally empowers each citizen in addressing the issue of global climate change.

The President's 1991 budget proposal seeks $175 million annually for 5 years to achieve the goal of planting, maintaining, and improving an additional 1 billion trees per year. This initiative has two parts: first, a rural component of $110 million with a planting goal of 970 million trees, and, second, a community component of $65 million with a goal of 30 million trees planted and cared for. The community component for FY 91 includes a one-time grant of $35 million from the Secretary of Agriculture to a private non-profit foundation designated by the President.

The rural component provides for tree planting and forest improvement in rural areas through technical assistance and cost-sharing with private landowners. This program will be implemented by expanding the existing network of professional forestry assistance available to landowners. Under the leadership of the Forest Service and State Foresters, coordinated assistance will be

available from State and Federal agencies, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, industry and the private sector.

Interested rural landowners will be assisted in determining suitable sites for planting and improvement work, selecting and obtaining tree seedlings, site preparation, planting and establishment of trees, and improvement efforts needed. We envision this to be a 50/50 Federal cost-share program with the landowners. Each State Forester will establish practices eligible for cost-sharing based on the forestry opportunities in their State. A plan will be developed to accomplish these activities consistent with the landowner's objectives. Landowners who recieve cost-sharing will be required to maintain the trees or improvements for a specified period (normally 10 years), in a similar manner to existing cost-share programs.

The planting potential is there. Current USDA surveys show up to 80 million acres of private woodlands are in need of conservation treatment or improvement. The USDA Soil Conservation Service's National Resources Inventory identifies almost 159 million acres of existing cropland and 86 million acres of pastureland that are "environmentally sensitive" and "economically marginal" for agriculture use.

The second part, the community component, will provide for an aggressive community tree planting program that relies heavily upon building coalitions of corporate and civic groups to provide both labor and funding to underwrite costs of tree planting and care in communities. In implementing this component we will build upon our existing network of over 100 cooperators. We also expect to greatly expand it to include groups not currently involved in tree

planting and care efforts. Interest indicates this can be expanded ten-fold to reach the goal of planting and caring for 30 million trees annually.

S. 2426 also authorizes the President to designate a charitable, nonprofit foundation that would promote public awareness and support the spirit of volunteerism, encourage private sector contributions, and oversee the use of these contributions to encourage tree planting and care projects. This foundation would be a complementary part of the expanded network I mentioned earlier. The foundation has also recieved support from existing, nationally known private tree planting groups and professional societies and organizations.

To reach our communities effectively, we will need to reach groups not traditionally involved in tree planting. We have had contacts with a variety of groups such as the National Cattlemen's Association, Episcopal Church of the United States, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Conference of Black Mayors, National Council of La Raza, National Urban League, National League of Cities, and many others. National service clubs like the Kiwanis and Rotary International have expressed interest. The American Association of Retired Persons, Garden Clubs of America, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and others have advised us their members are interested and ready to be mobilized. This has the beginnings of coalition building with volunteer groups on a scale not attempted before.

The need is truly great. Our cities and towns across America face unique and growing challenges. Deforestation is occuring in massive proportions. Only 1 tree is replaced for every 4 that are removed or die, and in some cities a

street tree only lives 7 years under current conditions. One million acres of forest land are lost to urbanization annually. In Atlanta alone, 20 percent of its tree cover has been lost in the last 15 years. S. 2426 is aimed at reversing this alarming trend. With eight out of every ten persons living in towns and cities, this bill addresses the quality of life for the majority of our citizens.

The time for such an initiative has come. An annual reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of up to 5 percent would occur if a program of this magnitude is continued over a period of several years. The potential is there when you consider fully two-thirds of these emissions could be offset if all private forest land currently in poor condition and all marginal and sensitive crop lands were planted or treated. Healthy trees use carbon dioxide at the rate of about 13 pounds per year or about 2.6 tons per acre per year. In other words, when new wood grows, carbon dioxide is removed from the air, the carbon is stored, and life-giving oxygen is released.

Tree planting and forest improvement in rural areas will not only help ensure future supplies of wood products, but also go a long way in assisting the economic revitalization of rural America. Current Forest Service RPA data shows an increase in forest products from private lands over the past ten years and current expectations see this trend continuing well into the future. Over the next 50 years a 70-percent increase in demand for wood from these nonindustrial lands is expected.

On rural lands, we have opportunities for multiple natural resource benefits. One such opportunity is to improve the biodiversity of plant and animal life.

Our action can affect not only wildlife and fish in the U.S., but also those in neighboring countries. Trees can be planted and habitats established for threatened or endangered migratory and other declining bird species. Water quality will be improved by wind and soil erosion reduction and fish and wildlife habitat will be created and enhanced. There will be increased recreational opportunities and the beauty of our natural landscapes will be greatly improved.

In our communities, trees also make good economic sense. Recent studies done by the Livermore Laboratories in Berkeley, California, show that cities create "heat islands". Temperatures are from 3 to 5 degrees greater than those in the surrounding countryside, resulting in increased energy needs for cooling. Strategic planting of trees around our homes would save from 15 to 50 percent on air conditioning bills, or as much as $4 billion annually.

The American Forestry Association estimates there are 160 million tree planting spaces available around homes and businesses in our towns and cities. Planting those trees could reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions from energy production by an estimated 18 million tons per year. Savings are also available in the winter when trees reduce heating costs through interrupted wind flow to the outside surfaces of homes.

As the President has stated, "Trees are one of our most valuable resources. They contribute to the environmental, economic, and social well-being of this country. They enhance biodiversity, wildlife, air and water quality, and recreational opportunities. Treee improve landscape aesthetics and property values, reduce soil erosion, and provide many valuable wood products. They

also contribute to energy conservation through the shading and cooling of buildings and by serving as windbreaks."

In closing, the President's proposal responds in a clear, simple, and coordinated way to an immediate national need--the need to promote, encourage, and support tree planting on rural lands and in community and urban areas. The President and Secretary Yeutter are fully committed to implementing the President's national tree planting and improvement initiative as quickly as possible. As the President said when planting a tree in Spokane, Washington, September 19, 1989, "We have an opportunity to renew the environmental ethic in America and to reassert U.S. leadership on environmental challenges around the world." We strongly urge the Congress to enact S. 2426.

We appreciate Senator Leahy and Senator Lugar's interest and leadership in the President's initiative, and we hope the bill will pass quickly. Thank you, Senator Kerrey, for holding today's hearing and for giving us this opportunity to testify. We would be pleased to discuss these or other issues related to S. 2426.

Senator KERREY. Mr. Crow, we will just go right to you.

STATEMENT OF TRAMMELL CROW, CHAIRMAN AND FOUNDING PARTNER, TRAMMELL CROW CO., DALLAS, TX

Mr. CROW. Thank you, Senator Kerrey, and I will, if I may, follow her example and submit my notes, and speak partially from them and partially just off my head.

Senator KERREY. Certainly. Your full remarks will be included in the record.

Mr. CROW. Yes, sir. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION

I thank you for this opportunity to present my perspective on the National Tree Trust Act. I am pleased that Chairman Leahy, Senator Lugar, Senator Dole, and Senator Mitchell, and 23 other cosponsors have introduced this legislation at President Bush's request. This act and the nonpartisan program of tree planting which it brings about will have a significant environmental, economic, and aesthetic impact which will endure to benefit the many generations who will follow us. This act will also create the opportunity for volunteer citizen involvement, a yardstick by which the President wants us to measure our lives.

I am a real estate developer, and except for my military service, that has been my entire life.

AS A DEVELOPER, I HAVE CONSISTENTLY USED TREES TO ENHANCE AND SUPPORT THE QUALITY OF THE DEVELOPMENTS WHICH WE BUILD

As a developer, I have consistently used trees to enhance and support the quality of the developments which we build. We presently in our company, which has grown in the 40-some odd years that I have been at it, manage property all over the United States, and there, too, we have learned that trees are the best investment we can make to support and preserve the quality of the work we do. And not only have learned that, but we follow it. I suppose in our time, we have planted thousands and thousands of trees, and we will continue to do so. I mention that in order to give support to my strong representations about the importance of the National Tree Foundation.

FOUNDATION

The Foundation, which I have had a part in establishing, has on its board Senator Baker, Mrs. Johnson, Senator Muskie, Peter Ueberroth, a name I think you might know, and myself, and some others. In addition, we will assemble a diverse capable and energetic council with expertise in fundraising, environmental issues, and urban forestry.

The purpose of the Foundation's establishment is to bring in the action of the private world into tree planting. The one time grant will get us started, but we believe we will give a multiple of 100 to 1 or 1,000 to 1 maybe even on the funds which we will be granted.

MEETING IN WASHINGTON OF VARIOUS EXISTING TREE PLANTING ORGANIZATIONS

Some time ago, a few months ago, we called together, I called, took the initiative, personally called together a meeting in Washington of various existing tree planting organizations. It was really stimulating as well as surprising to see how many cities have within them rising from their own initiatives whose sole purpose it is to plant trees in the cities.

Now our charter would be planting trees in the cities and on the highways. Part of the charter on the highways is to eliminate the bleak open stretches of the 5 million miles of highways that exist in the United States that do not have trees by them. And also to beautify the underpasses and overpasses which presently in many cases are simply stark concrete objects which have places where trees can grow and also which would be beautified by having trees there.

TREE ORGANIZATIONS IN MANY CITIES

I mentioned that there were tree organizations in many cities. I will list a few: Tree People in Los Angeles with a budget—strictly volunteer—with a budget of $2 or $3 million a year; Trees Atlanta; Trees Forever in Cedar Rapids; the Savannah Tree Foundation; Trees Utah; Treefolks in Austin, Texas; the Sacramento Tree Foundation; New York City Street Tree Consortium. Now these separate organizations arising from spontaneous enthusiasm, belief in the trees by those cities, all are supporting the existence or the creation of a national tree trust as an element which can help coordinate, give ideas, in cases give financial support. In many cases, give financial support to their activities, and there is no conflict arising in them.

There are, of course, other important national organizations and agencies such as the National Arbor Day Foundation, an organization which has brought planting trees down to being part of our American culture through their Arbor Day activities, the International Association of Arboriculture, the American Forestry Association with its Global ReLeaf Program, a program which extends throughout America and beyond America, a demonstration too of how the professional forestry business has its heart and its money behind the greening of America through tree planting.

QUOTE FROM PRESIDENT BUSH'S SPEECH

May I also quote from President Bush's speech on March 22, 1990, when he described his vision for this Foundation, which:

> Will help forge cooperation among individuals, businesses, governments and community organizations and provide financial assistance to grassroots volunteers to plant trees. It will help draw national attention to the need for increased planting of trees in our communities where, on average, only one tree is now being planted for every four that die or are removed. It is a program that will reach every State, if not each and every community. All of our citizens will be encouraged to participate in this program.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you to enact the National Tree Trust Act. I believe the President's vision of planting 1 billion trees a year is a realistic and achievable challenge. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I that on the grassroots level among American people, there is the dedication, the energy, and the willingness to get involved and to make a difference. Everybody is for trees. They just need the stimulation and this leadership and this coordination to get this surge of energy and hope that the American people have for tree planting going. The national tree trust will be the catalyst to organize and stimulate the volunteer commitment to meet the President's challenge.

I think it is necessary that the Foundation be stipulated by this act and that it be funded for its beginning year or years. Thank you, sir.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Mr. Crow.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Crow follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TRAMMELL CROW, CHAIRMAN AND FOUNDING PARTNER, TRAMMELL CROW CO., DALLAS, TX

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

I thank you for this opportunity to present my perspective on the National Tree Trust Act. I am pleased that Chairman Leahy, Senator Lugar, Senator Dole and Senator Mitchell and 23 other cosponsors have introduced this legislation at President Bush's request. This act and the nonpartisan program of tree planting which it brings about will have a significant environmental, economic, and aesthetic impact which will endure to benefit the many generations who will follow us. This act will also create the opportunity for volunteer citizen involvement, a yardstick by which the President wants us to measure our lives.

I comment first as a real estate developer and a builder, and I believe as a spokesman for the private sector business community. My main perspective is that of the chairman of the Dallas Parks Foundation, a nonprofit tree planting organization, which with a small staff and lots of volunteer involvement has been responsible for planting over 5,000 mature trees and 10,000 seedlings in Dallas since 1983.

As a businessman whose company has built, owns or manages millions of square feet of office, industrial, retail and residential property, I hope that I fairly represent the perspective of the private sector business community in commenting on the benefits that the President's National Tree Trust Act will bring to America.

This is an important opportunity; to challenge and inspire the business community's local involvement and volunteer contribution in planting trees along the parkways and medians of every main street, in neighborhoods and alongside local highways across America.

Tree planting has enormous direct economic benefits. Our company has planted tens of thousands of trees for their enhancement of property values alone.

The forest products industry is a multibillion dollar business.

This act will have a considerable impact on the landscape installation and maintenance industries, the nursery business and the forest products industry.

There will be a significant economic benefit from soil conservation and energy conservation.

Further, there will be a ripple effect on the recreation industry, the soil testing business, the fertilizer industry, the construction industry and on farming. I have observed that in Dallas the opportunity for quality job generation and growth in all these industries is increasing.

I have watched with pride and enthusiasm as local volunteers have given themselves and of their time and of their means to help plant trees.

The passage of S. 2426 and the establishment of the National Tree Trust will provide an enduring, evergreen foundation, which will serve as a permanent national resource to create, support, educate and inspire local nonprofit groups just like our Dallas Parks Foundation volunteers who are anxious to dig, to plant and to water trees to bring beauty, shade, clean air and economic value to their hometowns across America.

I have planted hundreds of thousands of trees in my lifetime in development and in public service, in support of our development business, and as a commercial tree farmer. I place great value on trees both as an important renewable resource to be cultivated as well as for their intrinsic value, as well as for their natural beauty.

In May I called together representatives of 35 tree planting groups to solicit comments on the creation of such a Foundation. The response from these local tree planting groups has been inspiring.

Examples of these organizations include: Tree People in Los Angeles, Trees Atlanta, Trees Forever in Cedar Rapids, the Savannah Tree Foundation, Trees Utah, Treefolks in Austin, the Sacramento Tree Foundation, New York City Street Tree Consortium, Friends of the Urban Forest in San Francisco, Trees for Houston and many others. Their interest in the creation of a National Tree Trust has been overwhelming.

There are also important national organizations and agencies such as "the National Arbor Day Foundation," "the International Association of Arboriculture," "the American Forestry Association" with its "Global ReLeaf" program, and the "American Association of Nurserymen," among others who have been very supportive and generous with their offers of cooperation and technical assistance for a National Tree Planting Foundation.

In almost every major city there are successful nonprofit tree planting groups who are eager to share ideas and experiences and help develop and to launch new fledgling groups in other cities.

From a funding standpoint, it is necessary that the National Tree Trust be initially funded at the national level. This will allow for setting up a national organization and provide it with operating funds to establish itself and ensure its ability to endure. With this beginning, the National Tree Trust will have the ability to establish itself permanently so as to continue to be a force supporting tree planting and related environmental concerns.

We have a board of directors which includes Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Howard Baker, Senator Edmund Muskie, Peter Ueberroth and myself. In addition, we will assemble a diverse, capable and energetic council with expertise in fundraising, environmental issues, urban forestry, promotion and marketing.

With this initiative, millions of trees will be planted in our cities and towns and along the roads and highways of America. Altogether, the quality of life, the natural beauty of our environment and the welfare of all our people will be secured and enhanced by President Bush's tree initiative. We will establish a legacy for planting and caring for trees, a legacy which will grow and enhance our country forever.

In President Bush's speech on March 22, 1990, he described his vision for this Foundation, which:

"Will help forge cooperation among individuals, businesses, governments and community organizations and provide financial assistance to grassroots volunteers to plant trees. It will help draw national attention to the need for increased planting of trees in our communities where, on average, only one tree is now being planted for every four that die or are removed. It is a program that will reach every State, if not each and every community. All of our citizens will be encouraged to participate in this program."

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you to enact the National Tree Trust Act. I believe the President's vision of planting 1 billion trees a year is a realistic and achievable challenge. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I that on the grassroots level among the American people, there is the dedication, the energy, and the willingness to get involved and to make a difference. The National Tree Trust will be the catalyst to organize and stimulate volunteer commitment to meet the President's challenge.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my viewpoint. I would be happy to respond to any questions.

Senator KERREY. We have a vote on. I think we will go vote and then come right back if you all do not mind sort of standing at ease until then. We will be right back.

Mr. CROW. Oh, sure.

[Recess.]

Senator KERREY. Let me get right into the questions, and again I appreciate your indulgence for the interruptions on the votes.

As I said in my opening comments, I have, in addition to taxpayer concern, which is connected to practically everything that is said, I have questions about the objective of the program and also

have questions concerning the exploration of alternatives, other alternatives that could be used, preexisting alternatives that could be used, or better alternatives that could be used.

Ms. Kearney, as I hear you describe the program, the principles are that you are trying to get the most trees, the most cost effective, should not create any new bureaucracies, and that it should target need. That leads into a discussion that there needs to be two parts, a rural and an urban part. I guess, as I say, apropos my intent to try to elicit a response that discovers where you are trying to go, would you describe or can you define for me the term "sustainable forest" which the President apparently is saying that this demonstrates the U.S. commitment to sustainable forestry? What does sustainable forestry mean? What are we demonstrating with this program?

Ms. KEARNEY. The commitment to sustainable forestry is really focused upon renewing our resources and making sure that we reforest our lands so that we at the very minimum have a commitment to reforesting all of our lands that produce usable commodities. Where there are private, nonindustrial lands that could be planted with additional trees, we would like to afforest them so we can go beyond sustaining our existing base.

Senator KERREY. Would this enable us, would 1 billion trees a year enable us to renew our forests?

Ms. KEARNEY. Well, we are essentially right now at a sustainable level in terms of the numbers of trees. On public lands, the Forest Service has a policy that they reforest and replenish anything that they are cutting. These trees being planted that we are focusing on with America the Beautiful would be on private lands.

Senator KERREY. Looks like Al—looks like Jose Canseco leaning into the plate—do you have a comment?

Mr. WEST. Well, I might say that there are really two parts to it. One is the continuous timber harvesting of the Nation's forested land with the concept of reforesting following harvesting. The other factor, though, is——

Senator KERREY. Are we at a sustainable level now?

Mr. WEST. We are——

Senator KERREY. Are we sustaining ourselves? Do we have a "no net loss" in forestry now? Are we reforesting more than we are losing?

Mr. WEST. On the national forests we are at that point. Now there are some forested lands in this Nation that are being taken out of forested land for other purposes, whether that is for agriculture or for development, you know, housing and so forth.

Senator KERREY. But on private lands?

Mr. WEST. On the private lands, that is right.

Senator KERREY. Are we at a sustainable level on private lands?

Mr. WEST. There is a slight decrease, a slight loss of forest land. But basically as we look at the Nation and its development over years, we have had a dropoff of forested land. Now we are leveling out. The President would like to reforest those lands to get them to the level of planted forests increasing rather than a leveling or a slight decline.

Senator KERREY. So why 1 billion a year? I mean is there some—slight is a word that I use a lot as well, but it is not terribly pre-

cise. What is a slight decline, and how does it correlate with 1 billion trees?

Mr. WEST. All right. In 1989 nationwide we planted about 2.1 billion trees in this Nation, about 3 million acres. The bulk of that (41.3 percent) was on the industrial forested lands, a small part of it on the national forests (10.2 percent). So our private lands have been——

Senator KERREY. How many acres? 2.1 billion? I am sorry.

Mr. WEST. 3.0.

Mr. DORRELL. 3.0 million acres and about 2.1 billion trees.

Mr. WEST. In 1989.

Senator KERREY. I apologize once for interrupting you.

Mr. WEST. That is fine.

Senator KERREY. It is just that I am not familiar with the term "industrial forests."

Mr. WEST. Excuse me. These are the companies that are in the tree growing business and into the timber harvesting business. We categorize the commercial forest land into industrial lands, lands that really belong to the big industry, versus the nonindustrial lands, those small landowners that make up the bulk of the forested land in this country, about 57 percent.

Senator KERREY. This program is looking at nonindustrial land?

Mr. WEST. That is right.

Senator KERREY. Fifty-seven percent. At the 57 percent.

Mr. WEST. Right.

Senator KERREY. And what is the status of that nonindustrial land now? And are we losing forested acres, and if so, how much, and if so, how much is going to be? I mean what does this billion trees do?

Mr. WEST. Let me ask Tony to answer that.

Senator KERREY. I assume the billion trees would correlate to approximately 1.5 million acres a year?

Mr. WEST. That is right. Correct.

Mr. DORRELL. With regard to the forest land situation in the country right now, we sort of have two projections. One, the long-term trend shows a decline.

Senator KERREY. How much?

Mr. DORRELL. Well, it is disputed at around 700,000 acres a year. In other words, the projections over a long-term showing decline are a loss of 700,000 acres annually. There are other projections which are based only on shorter term trends that show it closer to a no net loss right now. We are wrestling with those projections and trying to resolve the differences between the two approaches. But one thing for certain is that presently there is about 730 million acres of forest land in the country. And at the time Columbus discovered America there were about 1.1 billion. So over these last two or three centuries we have lost about 400 million acres of forest land in the United States.

Now much of that, of course, is losses to agriculture and losses to communities and development, and is very appropriate. There are some analysts who will say, however, that there is a good bit of that 400 million that could be returned to forest land, and that is what we are targeting and what we are looking at, the highly erodible, the economically marginal, the forest land that presently is

not very productive. It has low numbers of trees or poor quality timber on it and that sort of thing. So when Ms. Kearney talked about targeting, that is what the focus is on. It is really land that would be better off being in trees.

Senator KERREY. And as I understand it, the National Tree Trust Act of 1990 would deal exclusively with the urban areas as opposed to the——

Mr. CROW. Urban and highways, Senator.

Senator KERREY. Tell me about the highways. That is a curious objective for me. It seems to me that it might be more appropriate for us—I assume we are talking about State highways or Federal highways.

Mr. CROW. Any highways.

Senator KERREY. Or county highways.

Mr. CROW. Any and all.

Senator KERREY. It seems to me it would be a more appropriate thing to somehow encourage the States to get engaged in that task. Basically, the question that I would ask is why are we going to be targeting State, county, city highways?

Mr. CROW. I could not answer that question as you asked it. I would have to answer it by saying we are confident that we can and will get millions of trees planted along the roads and highways and superhighways and underpasses and interchanges of America that are not planted now. Whether it could be done by States or counties or not, I do not know. I think it would be unrealistic to believe you could organize the type of an effort with the probability of success that we believe we can do on a State or county basis.

Senator KERREY. What was the number you used? Five million road miles of highways?

Mr. CROW. Five million, over 5 million road miles of highways in America that are candidate for our treatment. Some of them are planted. Some States, New England—California is ahead of most States. Texas is probably behind most States. But we will not always be.

Senator KERREY. How have you split this thing up, Pat? Between the rural and the urban? What sort of distribution of resources and how did you calculate the distribution of resources between the rural and the urban?

Ms. KEARNEY. The President's budget proposed a total of $175 million for this initiative. Of that, $110 million would be targeted toward the rural tree planting initiative. And $30 million would be for community forestry and technical assistance that would be part of the Forest Service budget. And for the first year, $35 million would be allocated as a one-time grant to a foundation that would then use that money to raise other funds.

Senator KERREY. What is the rationale for distributing it in that fashion? A greater perceived need in the rural area by a factor of what—2 to 1? A greater perceived deterioration of actual deterioration of nonindustrial forestry in rural areas?

Ms. KEARNEY. That is mainly where the bulk of the trees can be planted. When you look at the numbers of trees, and we looked at the land available for tree planting, right now in terms of timberland by ownership percentages, 28 percent is public lands; industrial private land is 15 percent, and nonindustrial private land is

about 57 percent. Therefore, we are replanting all of the public lands used for commodity production purposes and those lands are owned for industrial purposes. So, really, the opportunities for planting are on the nonindustrial private land.

Senator KERREY. Was there a calculation that there is more of that in rural areas than there is urban?

Ms. KEARNEY. There is much more. Basically rural areas have open acreage, tree lots, some forested land that needs improvement, and I think maybe could——

Mr. WEST. One of the values, of course, of tree planting is the sequestration of carbon, and so the more trees you have the more carbon that is locked up by those trees. When you look at the acreage and the number of trees that can be planted in a cost effective way, you are looking at major difference between the cost of tree planting for the number of trees in the rural area. For example, a tree planted in the rural area maybe costs you 10 cents, in that order, for the tree, where it costs $40 or more for an urban tree.

Senator KERREY. Well, let me make it clear. I do not hear a precise answer on this definition of sustainable forest. I must tell you that.

Mr. DORRELL. Let me comment on that.

Senator KERREY. I am hearing "slight decline." But I do not hear a precise objective for what this program is intended to do. I still hear sort of general statements about global warming and the carbon absorption. These are all good things. We are all in favor of that. But what I am trying to determine is the bases by which you calculated that there should be distributed resources in the fashion that you have done, rural versus urban, all of which is designed to try to get some sense of what this means, this sustainable forest definition, and what is it that you are trying. You are asking the American people to get involved in a task that I think is good, but it is a general task.

Let us all get involved and reestablish the environmental ethic. That is a general task. But here we are spending specific resources and organizing a specific program, and I am trying to determine what the specific objective is.

Mr. DORRELL. The sustainable forestry thing came up in the international arena. And essentially it is dealing with deforestation that is taking place in other countries in the world. And so the label, sustainable forestry, is meant to show that when forests are harvested, they are going to be renewed, and it will not be the cut out and get out practices that took place in this country earlier and are now occurring in other places. So your use of the word "renew" before was probably the right word to put on to sustainable forestry. When you apply it to the United States, it is a little more complicated because of the different kinds of land ownership, and that is what we were referring to earlier.

One of the fundamentals of our approach to private land forestry in this country is that we will not regulate it from the Federal Government level. So it is based on a principle that the landowners themselves are going to have to decide what they want to do. So whenever we deal with projections and plans and numbers and that sort of thing, we have to take that into account. We are going to provide education, technical assistance, guidance, financial in-

centives, but they are going to have to volunteer to come into the program. So we are even dealing with intangibles in the human behavioral area as to whether the landowners will respond or not sometimes. And that is why I think you accurately can sense that some of these things are a little difficult to pin down sometimes. A lot of our earlier options analysis——

Senator KERREY. But, please, how do I know 3 years from now that we are doing a good job, Mr. Crow? This is one of the fundamental dilemmas for the Government. We do not, unless we establish what our objectives are, we really do not know if we are getting there. In your business I assume you have a rate of return that you are looking for and other sorts of numbers that guide you. In our business typically we do not. We typically wrap our projects in some worthy sounding objective, and everybody says, gee, that sounds terrific and we get onboard. How can you be opposed to planting trees, for gosh sakes? How can you be opposed to doing something that arrests carbon dioxide, for gosh sakes? How can you be opposed to something that is going to contribute to energy conservation?

One of my questions, Pat, to you, you use the word—some people have said that we could save $4 bill on. The question is are we going to plant trees so as to save $4 billion worth of energy? Are we going to organize precisely so as to accomplish that objective, and will energy conservation then become a part of each one of these efforts, whether it is in the rural or in the urban area? I am trying to ascertain what sort of numerical objectives we have here so as down the road to be able to properly measure whether or not we are getting there?

Mr. CROW. May I respond?

Senator KERREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CROW. For the part of the National Tree Foundation, the tree trust, it would be a precise and accurate way to describe the success we have had, and it could be done year after year for our objective is to plant trees for all the reasons you want trees in all the urban areas we can get and on all the highways we can get. The general effects of the planting, the beauty, the clean air, other such things, are important, but the purpose is specifically that there will be trees. We can plant them, we will plant them, we will take care of them, they will grow, and we will count them, and report them.

Senator KERREY. Is this something that will enable us to say that we are making progress toward a precise objective, not just of planting, getting 1 billion of them planted every year, but of reversing some, are we going to try to get to a point where if Christopher Columbus comes back, he says it is just like it was when I got here before? Is it a no net loss policy that underlies this thing? Is energy conservation what we are trying to get to? I do not think it is enough because I must tell you, Mr. Crow, the demand, at least in the State highways that I have driven on, is going to exceed the supply. And I would be a bit concerned, in fact, providing an incentive out there for States that they do not have, have not initiated an effort. I would be a little bit concerned about providing them an incentive to essentially not do much. But that is a separate point.

Again, I am trying to get a rationale other than just saying to Americans we are going to plant 1 billion a year.

Mr. DORRELL. Mr. Chairman, when we implement a program like this, because of the nature of the private land responsibilities in the country, we try to push this kind of detailed planning and objective setting down as close as we can to the ground level. So our approach on this program, for example, would be to establish at the State level committees and task forces who would address that State's needs and goals and objectives and determine for that State what kind of a program is realistic and could be done and what it would cost.

And our role in the Federal Government, then, is to coordinate that, help them do that, help train them and assist them and that sort of thing. But until we get going, we are not able to get started on this more intensive State level planning which, then, of course, is forced down even to local areas and further through this system. Even the landowners themselves in local areas have an opportunity to participate often in some of the goal setting and the targeting they do and that sort of thing. Our system is very decentralized and very delegated.

Ms. KEARNEY. In the evolution of the proposal, as we were developing the program, we saw that there were multiple benefits organizationally as well and I will comment on these from both the rural side and the urban side and how we will structure the program to ensure some accountability so we will be able to see exactly what is happening. Because there are so many benefits from planting trees and these benefits will be different in different areas and different regions, and as Tony Dorrell points out, a lot of the objectives will have to be set at the State and local level, we wanted an aggressive program, and we looked to see what was the optimal amount of trees that we could possibly plant with existing organizational structures while being very aggressive, and doing it in a cost effective manner.

We then felt that the organizational process would really refine particular objectives. In the rural area, those objectives would be worked out with a particular landowner. A technical assistance team would go out and work with that landowner and ask "what are your personal objectives for this land"? Some may want to just plant trees. Others may be interested in developing wildlife habitat. Others may be more interested in even going beyond that and try to enhance biodiversity. There will be different objectives for different landowners and probably even multiple objectives for different pieces of land that any one landowner has depending on the land.

In some cases the goal may be to improve the timber stand on the land. So implementation would have to be ultimately worked out with the person who owns that land. What we would ensure is a highly qualified team of professionals that will go out and prod them to incorporate as many of these different elements in their planning as possible. On the community tree side, right now there is a very good network with State and private foresters. What we envision happening in the community side is that a national council or coordinating body will be put together. Then there will also be other councils that will be put together on regional, State and

local levels. The system will have a variety of professionals and a variety of other organizations and groups that want to promote tree planting.

They will assess the priority needs for that particular State. They will determine available resources, and they will build upon the strongest resources in the State. Some organizations are strong in certain States but they are rather weak in others. And so the lead will go to different groups depending upon what the strengths are in that State, and then they will hone in on their objectives for each State. Again, nationally we would encourage incorporation of as many elements in the program as possible to get as many benefits out of every dollar spent as is possible.

We also believe it is very important as we embark upon this that it is very much a partnership and that the key players who are partners have some say-so in exactly how these details are developed so they have some ownership and commitment to making it happen. And I think that that is really going to be a key factor to the success of this program, that everyone at every level is vested in it.

Senator KERREY. Well, we are going to get the second panel out of respect for their time schedules as well. Do you plan to stick around in case I get some questions back from the other panel?

Ms. KEARNEY. Yes, I would be happy to.

Mr. CROW. I will stay, sir.

Senator KERREY. All right. Thank you very much.

The next panel is Mr. Sidney Butler, vice president of conservation with The Wilderness Society; Mr. Neil Sampson, the executive vice president of the American Forestry Association; Mr. Jim Hubbard, the president of the National Association of State Foresters; Mr. Lawrence Scovotto, executive vice president of American Association of Nurserymen; and Mr. Laurence Wiseman, president of American Forest Council.

Neil Sampson has an appointment on the other side of the Capitol, and so we will ask you to go first.

STATEMENT OF R. NEIL SAMPSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. SAMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Kerrey.

INTRODUCTION

It would be greatly appreciated if you would let me sort of get done. We are having hearings on the old growth situation over in the other body, and if you are a forest conservation organization these days that is sort of between tree planting and the President's proposal and old growth, it is like having a hot potato in each hand. And you do not know which way to shift them.

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

We are very pleased to be here today and support the President's proposals as part of the "America the Beautiful" initiative that would direct $175 million to a new emphasis on tree planting.

INVEST IN THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT MAKE SENSE FOR AMERICANS TODAY

Mr. Chairman, I think that the important thing in terms of goals and objectives is that we invest in the opportunities that make sense for Americans today. Our work has shown that there is a tremendous need for the Federal Government to provide the kinds of support for those investments, and that is what I would like to focus on, and hopefully we can add a little specificity to the questions that you were just talking about.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLANTING GOAL OF 30 MILLION URBAN TREES A YEAR IS WELL WITHIN THE RANGE OF NEEDS

For example, the President's planting goal of 30 million urban trees a year is well within the range of needs. We did a survey this past year that shows 60 million available planting spaces just on the streets, just for street trees, in America's cities. Other work that we have done indicates that that is about 10 percent of the need that exists in communities. In other words, the street trees run about 10 percent. That would suggest somewhere in the range of 600 million as the tree planting need in America's communities based on a 400 cities survey. And that then moves that an assistance program that encourages and draws out work at 30 million a year is pretty well within the range of needs. A 10-year program would only get 50 percent theoretically if those numbers are right, and that does not include mortality during that period.

We have to understand that we are in an ongoing situation. Unfortunately right now the average urban tree lives about 32 years compared to perhaps 100 or 200 years for its rural counterpart in that species. In some downtown areas that average life span is only 7 to 10 years. These trees live in the toughest biological conditions in the world. And so constant attention to that is needed. The problem with goals and numbers in this is also one of resources.

GLOBAL RELEAF CAMPAIGN

In our Global ReLeaf campaign, we established a goal of 100 million trees around America's homes and businesses for energy conservation by 1992.

We are pretty sure we are getting pretty close to reaching a trajectory that will take us there, but we cannot be sure, and the reason we cannot be sure is that we have a Hobson's choice. We either use our resources to set up a complicated accounting procedure or we use them to continue to push the work. We have chosen the latter. We really think that the importance of this whole effort is to mobilize Americans into taking control over and a positive approach to their own environment. The major gain we get out of the President's program, Mr. Kerrey, may be the attitude of American citizens and their approach to their environment in a positive and constructive way, and the tree count numbers may run up or down and not really be that terribly important.

Let me just say that on the Global ReLeaf campaign, which we started in October of 1988, we have been able to attract a great deal of private sector contribution. There is a lot of private sector interest just from citizens and from companies. We have around 60

companies, many of which are on the Fortune 500 list, that are now putting private sector donations into this effort. We had, for example, this Truckers for Trees thing, which went through Nebraska last week, donating trees at Boys Town and in North Platte, and it was just an example of a company, and Western Star Trucks, and a segment of our private sector that you would not have thought of if I had given you the first five ideas on how the private sector would be willing to contribute.

Buried in the 60 or 70 campaigns we have are a lot like that because it shows that Americans across a wide variety of activities are ready and willing to become a very, very important part of taking advantage of the opportunities to improve our own environment, and we think that this whole thing has brought two facts together. First, the American people are really ready to go. But the second is that because we are really trying to get people to take a different attitude about trees and forests and the environment, that we have to build private sector activities as fast as we build the public.

WE BELIEVE THAT THE FOUNDATION PROPOSED BY PRESIDENT BUSH CAN PLAY A CRITICAL ROLE IN ACHIEVING THIS

We believe that the Foundation proposed by President Bush can play a critical role in achieving this, as part of the President's total package, and we really do then support its activities. We have worked with Mr. Crow and with Ms. Kearney and with all the folks that are there, and we think we have hammered out the ideas in which we can all work together in a very constructive and cooperative way. There is not any room in this for competition or destructive counterplays, and we think we have that all very well worked out.

Mr. Chairman, that Foundation is the only part of this particular bill, S. 2426, that is not a part of the farm bill that is coming through the committee at this point. Our suggestions are twofold and it would simply be that if it is the committee's desire to assist the President and move this forward fairly rapidly, we would like to see the Foundation separated from S. 2426 and enacted immediately. If that is not feasible due to the congressional calendar, and that, we know, is a really difficult problem, perhaps it could be attached to the Senate's farm bill provisions on the floor so that it could pass and we could expedite this.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Kerrey, we just have discovered in the idea of encouraging to take advantage of their own opportunities to improve their environment that tree planting is one of the most popular things that we can do.

But I think the lesson it teaches is much more than this. It teaches us that in a world with 5.3 billion humans on it headed for a number we do not know that we have really only got a couple of choices, and one is for each of us to be slightly productive and constructive in rebuilding that environment or for each of us to be slightly destructive. We think the latter is a pretty bad way to go. We also think that is important for the United States to demon-

strate its leadership by its actions, and we think that is what is important about the President's proposal. Funding of $25 million for the Foundation or $175 million for the program is not so important for the dollars that it spends as for the lesson that it holds out and for the example that it holds out. We have millions and millions of dollars of private sector investment waiting in the wings to improve America's environment if the Federal Government will give that signal. We think that is the important thing. Thank you so much, sir.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Mr. Sampson.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sampson follows:]

AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION
balanced forest use
Founded 1875

P.O. Box 2000
Washington, D.C. 20013

1516 P Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

telephone (202) 667-3300

Statement of

R. Neil Sampson
Executive Vice President
The American Forestry Association

Before the

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
United States Senate

On the

National Tree Trust Act of 1990, S. 2426

July 24, 1989

Mr. Chairman. Members of the Committee:

I am Neil Sampson, Executive Vice President of the American Forestry Association. Our Association is the nation's oldest citizens conservation organization. For more than a century, we have been promoting the values of trees and forests, and the wise use and management of our nation's public and private forest lands. We are pleased to share with you today our views on the President Bush's tree planting and forest improvement proposals as incorporated in the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990" (S. 2426).

We strongly support the President's proposals, as part of the "America the Beautiful" initiative, that would direct $175 million to a new emphasis on tree planting and forest improvement efforts on rural lands and in community forests across the nation. The proposals have already received an enthusiastic response from individuals, corporations, and organizations across America, and we are convinced that they will continue to do so. We believe they can result in changes in this nation's forests that will have positive environmental and economic impacts throughout the 21st Century.

The proposals pick up the theme that our Association has been promoting since 1988 as part of our Global ReLeaf campaign. In light of the uncertainties associated with the global environment, as evidenced by the scientific concern over the "greenhouse effect" and the potential for significant, and damaging, changes in global climate, we feel that it is time to begin action. Happily, there are actions we can take right now that can be truly positive and beneficial. Planting trees and improving forest growth are the most cost-effective, easiest, and obvious. They make sense not only because of the their potential for greenhouse benefits, but because they can create so many other economic and environmental benefits that are justifiable in any event.

We learned in grade school biology that trees take up carbon dioxide, convert it to organic compounds, largely biomass, and give off oxygen as a byproduct. Today, having more forests taking up and storing more carbon dioxide, is an important element in re-stabilizing global environments and climates. Thrifty growing trees use carbon dioxide at the rate of about 26 pounds per year -- approximately 5 tons per acre per year.

Around our homes and small businesses, trees can be a very critical part of the greenhouse solution. Three trees, properly placed, can reduce air conditioning costs by 10 to 50 percent. This not only saves the homeowner or businessman real dollars in the short term, it reduces the peak demands for electricity, which translates into less energy demand, lower amounts of fuel burned, and reduced air pollution and carbon dioxide loading. Thus, the "community trees" element proposed by the President is a very important part of the whole picture.

The President's proposals include three basic components: a rural tree planting and forest improvement program, an urban and community tree planting and forest improvement program, and a private, non-profit foundation to promote private sector involvement. Here are some specific comments on each of these components.

The rural program proposes to spend $110 million per year on rural tree planting, reforestation, and forest management efforts. We believe that amount can be justified, and can be effectively absorbed and efficiently used by the existing delivery system. Years of working together to provide forest landowners with technical and financial assistance has developed a partnership between the Department of Agriculture agencies and their state and local partners that can make such a new program work very well. We urge strong Congressional support for this level of funding.

We have been working with the agencies and committees of Congress to help design the manner in which this rural program could be implemented. We believe that the Forestry Titles in the 1990 Farm Bills proposed by both the Senate and House Agriculture Committees contain significant and constructive rural forestry provisions that will help meet the President's goals. These titles build from the basis of traditional technical and financial assistance programs, done in cooperation with state forestry agencies, and propose new stewardship programs that give greater emphasis to environmental values in private forest land management. There are

significant opportunities for tree planting and forest improvement on rural lands throughout the nation. We believe that nonindustrial private forest landowners will respond favorably to the new programs which provide strong federal leadership direction, but also allow landowners to pursue a broader range of their own personal land management objectives.

The urban and community program proposes $30 million primarily to strengthen the existing technical assistance program to communities, as well as to provide for community cost-sharing program. We believe that amount can be effectively implemented by the partnership between the Forest Service, state forestry agencies, other agency cooperators at the state and local level, and the private sector. The Forest Service administers a cooperative urban forestry program in conjunction with state forestry organizations that has improved technical assistance capacity throughout America. This program, while it has been small in the past ten years, has established an excellent framework of technical capacity, and demonstrated what such a program can accomplish. Both the program and the technical assistance framework, however, is stretched much too thin in most states. More service foresters, specially trained in urban and community forestry techniques, are needed. This is important in meeting the needs of small towns in rural areas, where the community budget for local forestry programs is small or non-existent, and professional staff resources are equally unavailable. It is also important in larger communities that have urban forestry programs, but where the professional staff is usually overwhelmed by the challenges of growing and maintaining healthy trees in difficult urban environments.

Additional research is also badly needed. Urban trees live in some of the most difficult growing conditions imaginable, and more needs to be known about species adaptation and management under adverse urban conditions. Moreover, research in urban design is needed so that urban planners, designers, and managers know how to develop a community that can support a thriving urban forest.

The President's planting goal of 30 million trees each year is within the range of needs, as indicated by our best information. This is based on a 1989 survey by our Association that showed a need to plant over 60 million trees to fill empty spaces along our nation's streets. We estimate this to represent only about 10 percent of the overall need for tree planting on private property, around homes and businesses, and in parks, greenways and other community areas.

Once again, we have been working with the Forest Service, state forestry agencies, and the committees of Congress to help design an urban and community forestry program that would effectively implement the President's proposals. We believe that the urban forestry sections currently contained in the Senate and House 1990 Farm Bills -- in the Senate's Research Title and the House's Forestry Title -- provide for substantial improvements in the existing technical assistance, education, and research programs, as well as a new cost-share challenge grant program for communities. These expanded programs and new resources are essential for encouraging and harnessing more action by individual citizens and communities. Private citizens groups can often provide the energy, but do not have the necessary technical expertise and financial resources to plant trees, monitor forest conditions, and conduct improved tree care programs over the long-term.

Our Association has worked closely with the White House and others involved with the President's tree trust proposals on the concept of creating a private, non-profit foundation to promote private-sector involvement by encouraging financial support from corporations and enhancing the activities of citizens and community action groups. We are convinced that this foundation is an essential element to publicize and help encourage the types of public-private partnerships that have been shown to be so productive through programs like our Global ReLeaf campaign.

In 1989, Mr. Chairman, as a direct result of our Global ReLeaf citizen education, private-sector fundraising, and community organizing efforts, there were Global ReLeaf campaigns started in every state, and in thousands of communities. Fourteen states have developed a formal state Global ReLeaf program, as have 120 communities, and the number grows each week. The state forestry agencies have pitched in by designating a Global ReLeaf State Coordinator in every state, and we have over 350 cooperating private non-profit organizations who are dedicating their programs at the local level to tree planting and forest improvement.

On the private-sector front, we are working with more than 60 companies, many of which are in the Fortune 500 list, to develop national tree planting and educational compaigns. Last year, for example, Amway Corporation provided trees to its distributors, who in turn sponsored local tree planting and education programs in many communities. The Winery of Ernest and Julio Gallo provided funds that supported public-private partnerships in 11 cities across the nation. The Davey Tree Expert Company of Kent, Ohio, promoted Global ReLeaf through all its business locations across America.

This spring we developed a number of new corporate campaigns that had, and will continue to have, a tremendous impact in America's communities. McDonald's tested an environmental education and seedling distribution program in 9 market areas. This successful program will expand to a nationwide effort in 1991, distributing 12 million seedling trees as part of a major national educational campaign. Texaco initiated a major tree planting and improvement effort with projects in three cities -- Denver, Houston, and New Orleans -- that involved local government, local non-profit organizations, Texaco employees, and the general public. These successful efforts will lead to an expanded number of cities in 1991. Dayton-Hudson advertised Global ReLeaf and gave away trees in 36 major Midwestern markets, and the Rouse Company did likewise at 11 large shopping malls.

On Earth Day, hair salons that distribute Aveda Corporation products held "cut-a-thons" around the country, and raised $70,000 to support tree planting efforts and, in recent weeks, Global ReLeaf advertising has been part of the national advertising campaign for several of Ralston-Purina's cereal brands. Western Star Trucks completed a cross-country campaign that stopped at 10 cities, donating 450 fine new trees in each city as the result of cooperation with Mount Arbor Nurseries.

These campaigns, and other like them, have made Global ReLeaf the fastest-growing, most widely-noticed conservation programs in America today, Mr. Chairman. We think our experience underscores two facts. First, the American people will respond dramatically to the President's urban and community tree planting initiative. They have already swung into action -- the President's initiative will help the federal and state agencies catch up with them. Second, while this positive environmental initiative requires a great deal of money--both from an expanded federal program and from the support of private corporations, businesses, and individuals -- we must work hard to build the local citizen's component as fast or faster than we expand the program.

Our Global ReLeaf goal -- shared completely by the President's America the Beatiful Initiative -- is to to encourage Americans to "take charge" of their own local environment again, to rebuild the kind of civic and national pride that makes towns and neighborhoods a place where people are glad -- and proud -- to live. That demands a program that does not replace citizen energy with government energy, but which uses the leadership inherent in government to call citizens to new action.

We believe that the Foundation proposed by President Bush can play a critical role in achieving this, as part of the President's urban and community proposals, by generating expanded private-sector support. The Foundation should work cooperatively with the very large and eager non-profit conservation community that has grown up around America's community forests in recent years. Its role should be to provide resources to help well-meaning citizens learn to do things right, and to encourage sustained, long-term efforts by local groups.

The private, non-profit Foundation is the only element in the President's proposals that is not already well-represented in the Senate's 1990 Farm Bill proposals. We recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the Foundation proposal -- Title I of S. 2426 -- be separated from the rest of the bill and considered for passage as quickly as possible. If that is not feasible due to the Congressional calendar, we urge that the Foundation proposal be incorporated into the Senate's Farm Bill so that it can pass as part of the Forestry Title.

Mr. Chairman, public interest in tree planting and forest improvement has been raised to very high levels due to the President's proposals. Immediate funding of the entire $175 million amount proposed by the President is essential to provide a signal to the private sector that the federal government is serious about the goal of planting 1 billion additional trees each year for this decade. Private sector companies and local community groups are poised and waiting to respond. This funding will be especially critical in sending the signal that will result in many millions of dollars of private investment in nursery facilities, land use changes, and tree and forest improvement projects. The federal dollars are not so important for the direct work that they will do, as for the signal that they will send about the importance of this activity.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would be pleased to respond to any questions.

Senator KERREY. The next witness is Sydney Butler.

STATEMENT OF SYDNEY J. BUTLER, VICE PRESIDENT OF CONSERVATION, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, DC

INTRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, my name is Sydney Butler. I serve as vice president of conservation for The Wilderness Society. As you know, The Wilderness Society is a private conservation organization dedicated to the wise management and protection of the Nation's public lands, and on behalf of our more than 370,000 members, I am pleased to appear before you today to talk about improving our environment and reforesting our Nation's forests, and for better stewardship programs.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, when President Bush last January announced his America the Beautiful program, The Wilderness Society expressed several concerns about the program. While appearing to be a new commitment to the environment, the program does little more than repackage existing programs. Despite the packaging, some critical programs remain significantly underfunded. For example, the administration's request for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is only $250 million. That is less than one-quarter of the amount currently authorized to be spent by Congress each year.

Planting 10 billion trees over the next decade in urban and rural areas is a commendable goal. No one would quarrel with the findings of S. 2426 that trees "make important contributions to the environment, social, and economic well-being of both rural and urban areas across the nation." However, the administration's tree planting initiative should not come at the expense of programs that already exist within the Department of Agriculture, programs which already assist local and rural communities to develop and maintain—I stress maintain—projects that protect and foster environmental stewardship.

Specifically, the tree planting initiative should not substitute for the Forest Service's reforestation program. The President has proposed a $4.688 million funding decrease for reforestation. We recommend that funding be increased to reduce the reforestation backlog on national forests which is now at over 1.2 million acres to the minimum of 1½ years. Further, we need to eliminate below-cost timber sales—certainly it makes no sense to plant trees when the American taxpayer is losing in excess of $300 million per year on timber now taken from our national forests.

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE HAS WRITTEN STRONG STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY PROVISIONS IN THE 1990 FARM BILL

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the Senate Agriculture Committee has written strong State and private forestry provisions in the 1990 farm bill. The forestry section of the farm bill, for example, sets up public and private partnerships to protect 25 million acres of private forest land over the next 5 years. It targets 8 million private forest owners. It expands the financial and technical assistance

now given to State foresters and extension directors. It monitors forest health. It uses new forest management practices, promotes alternative forest crops, protects forest aesthetics and several other important benefits. Through cost sharing assistance, it enables owners of 5,000 acres or less of timberland to develop multiple use management plans if they agree to keep their land within the program.

CONCLUSION

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, The Wilderness Society's recommendation to the committee is, therefore, not to reinvent the wheel by forming new foundations and programs costing $175 million. Instead, the Society recommends adequate funding be provided for the forestry stewardship title of the 1990 farm bill, and increased funding for the reforestation program of the U.S. Forest Service. If we are to be true stewards of our lands, public or private, we must begin first with taking good care of our existing resources. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator KERREY. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Butler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SYDNEY J. BUTLER, VICE PRESIDENT OF CONSERVATION, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Sydney Butler, and I serve as vice president of conservation for The Wilderness Society. The Wilderness Society is a private, nonprofit, conservation organization dedicated to the wise management and protection of our public lands. On behalf of our more than 370,000 members, I am pleased to be before this committee today to testify on the need to improve our environment through continued efforts of tree planting, reforestation of our national forests, and better stewardship programs.

When President Bush last January announced his "America the Beautiful" Program, The Wilderness Society expressed several concerns about the program in its testimony before the appropriate authorizing committees in the House of Representatives. While appearing to be a new commitment to the environment, the program does little more than repackage existing programs. Despite the packaging, some critical programs remain significantly underfunded. For example, the request for the Land and Water Conservation Fund at $250 million is less than one-quarter the amount currently authorized to be spent by Congress each year.

Mr. Chairman, planting 10 billion trees over the next decade in urban and rural areas is a commendable goal. It makes sense environmentally to return to the Earth the many natural resources that have been extracted during the industrialization of the United States. Few would quarrel with the findings of S. 2426 that trees "make important contributions to the environmental, social, and economic well-being of both rural and urban areas across the Nation." However, the administration's tree planting initiative should not come at the expense of programs that already exist within the Department of Agriculture—programs which already assist local and rural communities to develop and *maintain* projects that protect and foster environmental stewardship.

Specifically, the tree-planting initiative should not substitute for the Forest Service's reforestation program. The President has proposed a $4.688 million funding decrease for reforestation. We recommend that funding be increased to reduce the reforestation backlog on national forests to a minimum of 1½ years. Finally, we need to eliminate below-cost timber sales—certainly it makes no sense to plant trees when the American taxpayer is losing in excess of $300 million per year on timber now taken from our national forests.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the Senate Agriculture Committee has written strong State and private forestry provisions in its 1990 farm bill. The Forestry section of the farm bill takes important steps to protect the planet's tree-cover. It sets up public/private partnerships to protect 25 million acres of private forest land. It targets 8 million private forest owners who manage 482 million acres of forest covered by an estimated 200 billion trees. It expands the financial and technical assistance

now given to State foresters and extension directors. It provides for monitoring forest health; using new forest management practices; promoting alternative forest crops; protecting forest aesthetics; developing recreational opportunities; and managing fish and wildlife habitat. It assists owners of 5,000 or less acres of timberland to develop multiple-use management plans if they agree to keep land within the program for at least 20 years (if Federal funds are used) and comply with Federal and State environmental laws.

Mr. Chairman, The Wilderness Society's recommendation to the committee is therefore not to reinvent the wheel by forming new foundations and programs costing $175 million. Instead, The Society recommends adequate funding be provided for the forestry stewardship title of the 1990 farm bill and increased funding of the reforestation program of the U.S. Forest Service. If we are to be true stewards of our lands, public or private, then we must begin first with taking good care of our existing resources.

Senator KERREY. The next witness is Jim Hubbard, president of the National Association of State Foresters.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. HUBBARD, PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

INTRODUCTION

I am Jim Hubbard, the State forester of Colorado, and president of the National Association of State Foresters (NASF). The State Foresters are the group who collectively service that 57, 58 percent of the nonindustrial private forest land that was previously mentioned. I think it is appropriate, Senator Kerrey, that the tree planter State is holding this hearing, the home of J. Sterling Morton and Arbor Day Foundation, and we thank Congress for its interest, and we really do believe that the America the Beautiful (ATB) proposal has the potential to move forestry in this country ahead a great deal.

Before I get into that, though, I would like to also thank the Senate Agriculture Committee for the interest that they have shown in forestry programs and conservation, specifically the conservation reserve, the forestry title, and I would like to thank you, Senator Kerrey, for your help with the agroforestry provisions of that title.

I am going to skip around a little bit from my written testimony, if that is okay, and comment a little bit about some of the remarks that have already been made.

THE STATE FORESTERS DO ENDORSE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL AND SUPPORT THE CONCEPT AS PUT FORWARD

I need to state that the State Foresters do endorse America the Beautiful and support the concept as put forward. As you say, it is hard to object to those kinds of worthy goals even though we do not have it pinned down specifically.

But I think it does send a powerful message to the American people, and for that message and the interest that ATB creates, it is worthy of consideration.

TWO INITIATIVES HAVE EVOLVED

I believe that two initiatives have evolved: forestry title in the Senate farm bill and America the Beautiful, independently by the

administration and Congress. And this provides the recognition that it is time to elevate our environment, our forests, our soils, water, air, wildlife, to a national priority in some manner. The goal of planting 1 billion trees a year does provide some specificity and can be put in the context of what each individual State will do. But I think it goes beyond that in the potential partnerships that can be created, and in formalizing working relationships.

DELIVERY SYSTEM IN PLACE

We have a delivery system in place through State and private forestry, through the State forestry organizations. That delivery system in all aspects of America the Beautiful can respond. And what we have found, though, with the Forest Stewardship Program that Congress initiated last year is that as we formalize our partnerships, we are able to do more than we ever expected. State forestry organizations have worked with wildlife, soil and water, and recreation agencies for some time. When we formalized these relationships under forest stewardship we learned a lot of new lessons as to what we could do. Those folks did not just come to the table to get stewardship assistance. They brought with them resources, and the attitude that if we were going to implement in this shared objective manner, they had something to contribute, too, so we gained much more. That was a lesson we learned with stewardship. I think that is something we will see with America the Beautiful as a theme, as a concept.

COMMUNITY TREES

The community trees portion Neil Sampson of AFA adequately described. State and private forestry has been working with communities since 1978 in urban forestry programs. What we have been doing is building a program base that directed effort and maintained investment, and that base now exists in most States on a limited basis. I think you will see community trees take managed urban tree planting considerably further. It will attract and focus the interest that we have seen in tree planting. A base to build on is there. It needs strengthening, and to go as far as 30 million trees a year in the urban areas would take some additional financial resources, but I think it is a program that is really ready to happen, and I think with Arbor Day Foundation and American Forestry Association, the Nurserymen's Association, the International Society of Arboriculture, and all the private interests that are ready to join in, it provides a focus for the kind of leadership that it will take to bring the effort together and make it work.

FOUNDATION

Speaking of the Foundation, NASF supports the purpose of the Foundation to bring together the private financial resources that may want to participate. We encourage thoughtful consideration to the role, to make sure the Foundation blends with other programs, and I think you heard Mr. Crow describe that as their objective. If the Foundation proposal were to move ahead, and we recommend that it does, with the purpose described, it could provide sustaining resources to the community tree effort into the future.

RURAL TREES

As to the rural trees, you were inquiring about the objectives, and Mr. Dorrell told you the long-term trend says maybe we are losing 700,000 acres per year. I do not think we have definitive statistics, but I know that we have a lot of indications of downward trends. Another trend that we are concerned about is that on the private land, only 10 percent of the harvesting that takes place does so under a plan that assures reforestation. We definitely feel that needs some attention. A billion trees reaching 1½ million acres certainly is within what I believe it will take to begin to achieve no net loss into the future. And we have not even considered the impacts of what the Resources Planning Act shift to State and private lands might mean, the Threatened and Endangered Species Act, the land set aside for wilderness and the forest plan appeals. All this is decreasing available Federal timber supply, which means State and private lands will be called upon to make up the difference. So to make sure that State and private lands receive the kind of tree planting attention that they need to keep up with demand, I think the rural tree component is important.

A CONCERN IS THE COST-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

A concern is the cost-sharing arrangements. The administration has proposed the least cost arrangement, but there are other arrangements out there that a landowner will consider when choosing participation. To achieve the goal, I think, how this proposal fits in with other programs, needs to be considered. We especially think that the U.S. Forest Service needs to participate directly, or better yet be responsible for developing the guidelines for the rural tree components.

What has held us back in previous tree planting efforts has been agencies that were not technically oriented to tree planting, did not have that as their priority. I think within State and private forestry and Forest Service that could be overcome. But I think America the Beautiful and the rural tree component has to be a combination, has to be thought of as a total effort that fits in with forest stewardship, with the Forest Incentive Program, with the Agriculture Conservation Program, and with the Conservation Reserve Program. These programs all plant trees. They all provide Federal incentives to plant trees, and it all needs to fit together.

As an example of what State forestry thinks can happen with public-private participation, I will use living snow fence which actually started in Nebraska and has to do with planting along highways for wildlife habitat, to keep snow off the roads, to reduce the energy it takes to clear those roads. Trees have been shown to be much more effective and more cost efficient than slatted wood fence, and Nebraska developed that concept. In Colorado, we wanted to transfer that technology. We decided that we would establish four demonstration living snow fences in the State. We wanted to do that, though, without any payments to landowners. It was on a voluntary basis. And the project had to be carried by local folks that wanted to contribute to this.

So the State provided seedlings and some establishment supplies, minimum amount of what a total project would cost to establish

and maintain over a 5-year period until it was well-established, and we found that in putting that call out, we had more demand to participate than we could service, and 5 years later, we did not just get four. We are up to 140 projects that folks are participating in, and they are coming forward wanting to do more all the time. So with just a little bit of seed money, if you will, that has gone further than we ever expected, and that is a concept of America the Beautiful that I think we have not realized to the fullest potential.

The common thread in all of this is the State forestry delivery system, and we very much encourage the use of the system, and recommend the ATB proposal be handled through State and Private Forestry of the U.S. Forest Service. I think it is a chance, with the visibility on conservation ethic today, to provide a legacy for future generations. Pulling all this together is the important part, and allowing Americans to participate in the simple act of planting a tree to help the environment is a worthy cause. Thank you, sir.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Mr. Hubbard.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hubbard follows:]

The National Association of State Foresters

Testimony Before
Senate Agriculture Committee
James E. Hubbard, President
National Association of State Foresters
July 24, 1990

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is an honor to be here today. My name is Jim Hubbard and I am president of the National Association of State Foresters (NASF). The State Foresters are the directors of the fifty state forestry agencies. Collectively, we assist in protecting, servicing and managing 57 percent of the nation's commercial forest lands.

I would first like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation on behalf of all the State Foresters for the attention and support you and the Senate Agriculture Committee have given to forestry programs and environmental issues over the years. We especially appreciate your support of tree planting under the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).

I would also like to commend you and the Committee for your leadership that is responsible for establishing the first Forestry Title ever in a Farm Bill. I compliment you on work well done. Many of the members of this Committee have made very significant contributions to that regard. I know that you, Senator Kerrey, with Senator Daschle, are responsible for the agroforestry provisions that are very important to the Great Plains.

The Forestry Title sends a serious message that Congress is concerned with the issues and problems that confront the management and protection of our nation's private forest lands. I do not know anyone who questions the fact that our private forest lands are going to increasingly play a major role in providing economic, environmental and social benefits to society in the future. The Forestry Title expands current programs and authorities giving far greater emphasis to the role of private forest lands. Additionally, the Forestry Title provides for greater coordination and cooperation needed to face challenges of the future.

444 North Capitol Street NW Suite 526 Washington, DC 20001

I have been invited here today to discuss another important initiative, the Administration's "National Tree Trust Act" (S. 2426) legislation, also known as the *America the Beautiful* initiative, which will leave a lasting contribution on our nation's private forests for many years to come. The State Foresters have endorsed and supported this initiative since it was first proposed by the President in his Fiscal Year 1991 budget last January and later introduced as legislation in the House and Senate. The State Foresters applaud the Administration's leadership and commitment to conservation efforts and the environment as represented by *America the Beautiful* .

I strongly believe that these two initiatives, both of which have evolved independently by the Administration and Congress, represent a recognition that it is time to elevate our environment -- our forests, soil, water, air, and wildlife resources -- to a level of national priority. For the welfare of our nation, we cannot afford to take our natural resources for granted.

As the Administration has proposed in the budget, S. 2426 authorizes $175 million to implement the community and rural components of *America the Beautiful*. The goal of the initiative is to plant and improve one billion trees a year throughout our nation's communities and rural areas over the next five years. This is an ambitious goal, but one which the State Foresters with the help of our partners can provide. The Administration and Congress have made commitments, and now, so have the State Foresters.

We, the State Foresters in partnership with the Forest Service, are able do this because we have an efficient and working delivery system already in place. There is no need to create a new agency or bureaucracy, nor do we need to design new national programs. We also have the experience in both urban forestry and rural tree planting which will be required. What we need is the financial commitment, which the Administration has already given, to expand our program partnerships.

To the State Foresters, *America the Beautiful* is an opportunity to make a solid, long-term and long-needed investment through State and Private Forestry programs to the nation's private forest resources. State and Private Forestry programs administered under the Forest Service provide the framework that will deliver *America the Beautiful*. In addition, these programs, adequately funded, will provide the means, through technical and financial assistance, to protect and manage the billions of trees we plant. In place, we have an urban forestry program and a forest management program. Last year, the State Foresters successfully worked to fund the Forest Stewardship Program with the objective to reach more landowners who have yet to bring their forested lands under comprehensive resource management. Our friends in Congress have continued to refine this program in the Forestry Title to a point which we believe plays a critical role in *America the Beautiful*.

Community Trees
The Community Trees component of *America the Beautiful* proposes $30 million to plant 30 to 40 million trees throughout our nation's urban and rural communities. Recognizing the need for programs to manage our community forests, many States have active urban forestry programs. The Forest Service has operated the urban forestry program I mentioned previously, in partnership with state forestry agencies and other professional organizations since 1978. As a result of these efforts, 31 States currently have full time urban forestry specialists.

We do not anticipate any problems planting 30 to 40 million trees a year. Our major challenge will be recruiting and educating the citizens who will be responsible for maintaining these trees. Much of the effort will depend on working closely with the partners we already have such as the Arbor Day Foundation and the American Forestry Association, as well as forming new ones.

Foundation
An important component of the "National Tree Trust Act" is the proposal to establish a non-profit foundation, with a one-time grant for raising funds, promoting the community program and mobilizing the public and private sectors to work cooperatively together. NASF supports the purpose of establishing such a Foundation. However, we strongly encourage that thoughtful consideration and examination be given to the role of the Foundation and how it is expected to blend in with programs of other non-profit organizations carrying out similar work.

Rural Trees
As part of *America the Beautiful*, the Administration has proposed $110 million dollars to plant trees on environmentally sensitive cropland and marginal pasturelands and to improve management on existing non-industrial private forest lands.

We have had recent ample experience planting over two million acres in trees under the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The Forestry Incentives Program (FIP) and the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP) are two other federal assistance programs which we work through to plant and improve private forest lands.

From these programs we have learned several things that will be critical to the success of the rural program. Those are: (1) cost-sharing alone may not provide sufficient incentives to plant the number of trees we want; and, (2) it is essential that the Forest Service write the associated program guidelines.

We strongly believe to attain the President's goal, several different programs will have to be utilized in order to reach the private landowners. These include the rural and urban components of *America the Beautiful* as well as Forest Stewardship, the Conservation Reserve Program, the Agricultural Conservation Program and the Forestry Incentives Program.

The common thread of all is an in-place delivery system through State Forestry agencies. We can capitalize on the current visibility of conservation ethics to provide a legacy for future generations by pulling all the tree planting programs together into a coordinated approach.

The United States can replenish its renewable forest resources and make a statement to the world we are serious about improving our environment. Together with private partners more can be accomplished than ever before. The time is right.

Senator KERREY. The next witness is Lawrence Scovotto with the American Association of Nurserymen.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE SCOVOTTO, EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. SCOVOTTO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Lawrence Scovotto, executive vice president of the American Association of Nurserymen (AAN), and request that our full statement be entered into the record and which I will summarize at this time.

Senator KERREY. Without objection.

Mr. SCOVOTTO. We welcome the opportunity to present the nursery and landscape industry's views regarding S. 2426, the National Tree Trust Act of 1990.

NURSERY INDUSTRY BACKGROUND

AAN is the national trade association of the nursery and landscape industry. We represent nearly 4,000 firms across the country engaged in all aspects of environmental horticulture—nursery crop farmers, landscape specialists and garden center retailers. By almost any standard, our members are primarily family farms and small businesses.

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates farmer cash receipts of nursery and greenhouse crops in 1988 at $6.9 billion. The nursery greenhouse industry accounts for approximately 10 percent of all farm crop cash receipts ranking third behind soybeans and corn in plant crops. The nursery/greenhouse industry also accounts for more farm cash receipts than wheat or cotton.

NURSERY AND LANDSCAPE INDUSTRY'S SUPPORT FOR THE "AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL" TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE

AAN applauds the Bush administration's commitment to a nationwide tree planting initiative embodied in America the Beautiful. We commend Senators Leahy and Lugar for introducing S. 2426 and strongly endorse the bill.

PRIVATE NURSERY INDUSTRY TREE PRODUCTION LEVELS

The private nursery industry is ready, willing and able to provide all of the quality caliper-sized trees and other plant material needed for the urban and community component of America the Beautiful. Some have questioned whether there are sufficient numbers of quality, caliper-sized material available for the planned 30 million tree plantings in the urban community. And Mr. Chairman, you also raised that concern earlier in the hearing.

Well, to respond to these doubts and concerns, AAN commissioned in December 1989 an independent survey of the private nursery industry to gather solid data on current tree production levels.

The results of the survey are impressive and suggest that the private nursery industry is presently producing at a 78.3 percent level, which translates into 411.8 million caliper-sized trees.

If the private nursery industry was to fully utilize all of its acreage at its current disposal, the statistics suggest a production level of 525.9 million caliper-sized trees. So the nursery industry has the capability of producing an additional 114.1 million caliper-sized trees, representing a 20 percent increase in demand.

THE FOUNDATION'S ROLE IN THE NECESSARY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN TREE PLANTINGS, MAINTENANCE, AND IMPROVEMENT

It is very appropriate and advantageous that the U.S. Forest Service coordinate "America the Beautiful." Its forestry expertise is invaluable and its long track record in working with the private sector is highly commendable. Moreover, AAN wishes to take this opportunity to thank the U.S. Forest Service for bringing together key private sector groups, including AAN, and facilitating the continuing discussions over the tree planting initiative.

It is noble to embark upon an ambitious tree planting program, but technical assistance must be available. First, appropriate tree site selections must be identified. Second, planting site preparations must be conducted. Third, suitable plant material to an area's unique climatic and environmental growing conditions must be selected. Lastly, the trees must receive continued afterplanting maintenance. If a tree planting program does not incorporate all of these essential elements, it will not succeed. This is why AAN and the nursery industry enthusiastically support "America the Beautiful" because it is a complete program.

Presently, there is a mechanism which can and does handle rural reforestation activities. The U.S. Forest Service and the State foresters do an extraordinary job in this area, and it is upon them that the rural component of "America the Beautiful" initiative must rely to succeed. However, a similar single mechanism does not presently exist to handle caliper-sized trees which comprise the urban and community component of "America the Beautiful." There seems to be a need to have in place one credible and recognized group to address and provide the necessary technical assistance noted above. The National Tree Trust Foundation proposed in S. 2426 could provide the overall guidance and technical assistance which the urban and community tree planting component will require.

AAN believes the proposed Foundation, relying upon the technical expertise offered by nurserymen, landscape specialists, arborists, State foresters, and others, could help direct and deliver invaluable outreach technical assistance programs to communities and organizations in their tree planting and maintenance projects.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, AAN strongly endorses S. 2426 and the "America the Beautiful" tree planting initiative. AAN urge this committee to follow the lead established by the House Agriculture Committee in incorporating "America the Beautiful" into the forestry title of the 1990 farm bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Mr. Scovotto.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Scovotto follows:]

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN

1250 I STREET, N.W. / SUITE 500 / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 / 202/789-2900

STATEMENT BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
UNITED STATES SENATE
JULY 24, 1990

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The American Association of Nurserymen (AAN) welcomes this opportunity to present the nursery industry's views regarding S. 2426, titled the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990."

I. NURSERY INDUSTRY BACKGROUND

AAN is the national trade association of the nursery and landscape industry. We represent nearly 4,000 firms across the country engaged in all aspects of environmental horticulture -- nursery crop farmers, landscape specialists and garden center retailers. By almost any standard, our members are primarily family farms and small businesses.

The Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U. S. Department of Agriculture estimates farmer cash receipts of nursery and greenhouse crops in 1988 at $6.9 billion... and, the demand for nursery, floral and other environmental horticulture crops continues to increase dramatically. In fact, the growth rate in numbers of companies in the nursery/greenhouse industry is one of the highest in American agriculture -- at least 10% annually or nearly twice the pace of the general economy. The industry accounts for approximately 10% of all farm crop cash receipts -- ranking third behind soybeans and corn in plant crops. The nursery/greenhouse industry also accounts for more farm receipts than wheat or cotton.

An ERS analysis estimates that total consumer expenditures in 1988 for American floriculture and environmental horticulture products were approximately $27 billion. While all greenhouse and nursery products such as trees, flowers and other plants, bulbs and seeds were included in this figure, it excludes landscape services, related labor and material, as well as product resales and accessories. Comparatively, total consumer expenditures for fresh produce (fruits and vegetables) in 1988 were estimated at $37 billion. Consumer spending for floral and potted plant items in the United States increased at an inflation-adjusted 46% in 1988 over 1982.

II. NURSERY AND LANDSCAPE INDUSTRY'S SUPPORT FOR THE "AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL" TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE

AAN applauds the Bush Administration's commitment to a nationwide tree planting effort as part of a major new environmental

initiative -- "America the Beautiful." Moreover, AAN vigorously endorses "America the Beautiful" and we strongly urge Congress to approve the initiative.

AAN believes that as a nationwide tree planting, maintenance and improvement program, "America the Beautiful" offers individual citizens the opportunity and incentive to revitalize and better the American landscape. Not since the days of Lady Bird Johnson has the White House taken such a strong stand on the importance of tree planting.

"America the Beautiful" is much more than an aesthetic landscape project. It is proven that plants provide many tangible environmental, social and economic benefits to society, as they (1) clean the air by removing carbon dioxide; (2) reduce energy consumption by providing cooling shade; (3) reduce soil erosion; (4) enhance wildlife habitat; (5) provide shelter from the wind; (6) increase property values; (7) produce valuable wood products; and, (8) provide job opportunities.

The President has proposed that the "America the Beautiful" initiative be funded at a $175 million level for FY91. It is our understanding that this includes $110 million for rural tree planting and improvement, and $65 million for tree planting and improvement in urban areas and communities. The initiative calls for the planting, maintenance and improvement of one billion trees per year over the next several years. Of this total, 30 million trees per year are envisioned to be planted in up to 40,000 communities across the Nation.

III. SOURCE OF TREES TO FULFILL THE RURAL COMPONENT

It is our understanding that the forest industry and government nurseries will comprise a substantive source of the plant material for the rural component of "America the Beautiful." Yet, the massive scope of the rural component will require many sources to be involved -- including the private nursery industry. In order to ensure the initiative's success, "America the Beautiful" must utilize the services and delivery systems already in place throughout the private and public sectors and must complement -- not compete -- with private sector market forces.

To this end, AAN urges Congress to direct the U. S. Forest Service to place administrative emphasis on utilizing the private sector to help fulfill the rural component of "America the Beautiful." In the proposed FY91 budget for "America the Beautiful," no funds are proposed for expanding the production of any government-run nursery. This is as it should be.

IV. PRIVATE NURSERY INDUSTRY TREE PRODUCTION LEVELS

With respect to the urban and community component of "America the Beautiful," the private nursery industry is ready, willing and able to provide all of the quality caliper-sized trees needed. Some have questioned whether there are sufficient numbers of quality, caliper-sized material available for 30 million tree plantings per year in urban communities.

To respond to these doubts, an independent survey of the private nursery industry in the United States was commissioned at AAN's request in December 1989. The purpose of the study was to gather solid and credible data on current tree production levels. This data was then to be used as the foundation for a statistical model from which to predict current production capabilities over and beyond existing levels.

Of the sample group of 1,200 growers (both AAN members and nonmembers) selected to be surveyed, a solid 37.4% (or 449 growers) responded before the cut-off date and were included in the analysis. The study surveyed current production of the following types of landscape-sized trees:

(1) ornamental trees: 1" caliper and under;
(2) ornamental trees: 1" to 2" caliper;
(3) ornamental trees: 2" caliper and over;
(4) shade trees: 1" caliper and under;
(5) shade trees: 1" to 2" caliper;
(6) shade trees: 2" caliper and over;
(7) evergreen trees: 4' height and under; and,
(8) evergreen trees: over 4' in height.

The results of the survey are impressive. The statistical model suggests that the private nursery industry is presently producing at a 78.3% level -- or is presently producing 411.8 million caliper-sized trees. This figure includes 32.3 million fruit and citrus trees which may be utilized in residential landscape settings.

If the private nursery industry was to fully utilize all acreage at its current disposal, the statistics suggest a production level of 525.9 million caliper-sized trees. This suggests that the private nursery industry has the capability of producing an additional 114.1 million caliper-sized trees, which represents a 20% increase in demand. The survey is representative of the entire private nursery industry within a statistical margin of error of +/- 2.5%.

Historically, government nurseries have not competed with the

private nursery industry in producing caliper-sized trees. This, too, is how it should be ...and must remain. The survey results noted above demonstrate the current and future capability of the private nursery industry to provide all of the plant material needed to fulfill the urban and community component of "America the Beautiful."

Again, AAN respectfully urges Congress to direct the U. S. Forest Service to place administrative emphasis upon utilizing the private sector as the sole plant material source for the urban and community plantings under "America the Beautiful."

V. THE FOUNDATION'S ROLE IN THE NECESSARY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN TREE PLANTING, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

It is very appropriate and advantageous that the U. S. Forest Service coordinate "America the Beautiful." Its forestry expertise is invaluable and its long track record in working with the private sector is highly commendable. Moreover, AAN wishes to take this opportunity to commend the U. S. Forest Service for bringing together key private sector groups, including AAN, and facilitating the continuing formative discussions over the tree planting initiative.

It is noble to embark upon an ambitious tree planting program, but technical assistance must be available. First, appropriate site selections must be identified. Second, site preparations must be conducted. Third, suitable plant material to an area's unique climatic and environmental growing conditions must be selected. Lastly, the trees must receive continued after-planting maintenance. If a tree planting program does not incorporate all of these essential elements, it will not succeed. This is why AAN and the nursery industry enthusiastically support "America the Beautiful." This initiative poses a complete program whose aim -- to improve the environmental quality of both urban and rural life in this country -- is something with which all Americans can identify, and in which they all can actively participate.

Presently, there is a mechanism which can and does handle rural reforestation activities. The U. S. Forest Service and the state foresters do an extraordinary job in this area, and it is upon them that the rural component of the "America the Beautiful" initiative must rely to succeed. However, a similar single mechanism does not presently exist to handle caliper-sized trees which comprise the urban and community component of "America the Beautiful." There seems to be a need to have in place one credible and recognized group to address and provide the necessary technical assistance noted above. The National Tree Trust Foundation proposed in S. 2426 could provide the overall

guidance and technical assistance which the urban and community tree planting component will require.

AAN believes the proposed Foundation, relying upon the technical expertise offered by nurserymen, landscape specialists, arborists, state foresters and others, could help direct and deliver invaluable outreach technical assistance programs to communities in their tree planting and maintenance projects.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, AAN strongly supports S. 2426 and the "America the Beautiful" tree planting initiative. The nursery and landscape industry believes that the "America the Beautiful" tree planting initiative will prove an environmental legacy for future generations. AAN urges this Committee to follow the lead established by the House Agriculture Committee in incorporating "America the Beautiful" into the forestry title of the 1990 Farm Bill.

Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to present the views of the nursery and landscape industry regarding S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990."

Senator KERREY. The next witness is Laurence Wiseman of the American Forest Council.

STATEMENT OF LAURENCE WISEMAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FOREST COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. WISEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

INTRODUCTION

The organization that I represent in turn represents the private forestry interests of the forest products industry, companies which, as Mr. West indicated, have about 70 million acres of America's forest land and, with private landowners, plant on average about 3 million trees a day.

WE HAVE A STRONG INTEREST IN AND ENDORSE THE GOALS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE

Because we are tree-planting, tree-growing and tree-using companies, we have a strong interest in and endorse the goals of the President's tree planting initiative.

We found ourselves, however, in very much the same position the Senate finds itself in now. We asked ourselves as we looked at the initiative why, why should we support it?

TREES ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT AND SATISFY IMPORTANT HUMAN NEEDS—DEMANDS FOR THESE RESOURCES ARE GROWING

Let me see if I can join my fellow witnesses and add some precision to the answers to that question and track with you the kind of thinking that we went through as we arrived at our decision to support the initiative.

WHAT THE NONINDUSTRIAL FOREST BASE IS IN THIS COUNTRY AND HOW IT IS ORGANIZED

To do that we have to understand, I think, a little bit better just what the nonindustrial forest base is in this country and how it is organized. As Al West pointed out, 58 percent of the forest land is owned by private individuals. In fact, it is owned by about 6 to 7 million private individuals. But of that 7 million individuals, only about 600,000 to 800,000 now own tracts that might be considered commercially utilizable—tracts of 100 acres or more. And of those 600,000 to 800,000, we have learned through some demographic studies conducted by the Forest Service and others that there is a very interesting and possibly challenging intergenerational phenomenon going on. These landowners are aging. They are beginning to die and pass on their lands to their heirs.

So that we find that over the future, we are going to be dealing with a landowner community that not only is somewhat larger and more dispersed, it is also going to be much more diverse in its interests and its objectives for its forest lands. We have to balance that against some known facts. For example, as Jim Hubbard pointed out, only 10 percent of the landowners currently managing forests are doing so under a management plan. And the best estimates that we have indicate that less than half of the acres that

are harvested are actually regenerated intentionally by the landowner after harvest.

WE ALSO HAVE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT WORLD DEMAND AND DOMESTIC DEMAND FOR WOOD FIBER WILL INCREASE

We also have to take into account the fact that world demand and domestic demand for wood fiber will increase. The Forest Service estimates that domestic demand is going to go up approximately 50 percent and that world demand for fiber, for shelter, communications, packaging—all the uses to which wood fiber is put—is expected to double. Likewise, we expect that demand for forest based recreation and other amenity values are going to increase at the same time that the U.S. population expands into the very areas we are now using to meet our wood fiber needs from working forests.

Our view, after we finished this exercise, was that we needed trees and forests to meet both our economic and our amenity needs. And we needed integrated programs that would enable us as a nation to provide that particular resource.

It is our belief, and in fact our firm conviction that in the United States—with the soils, the climate, the capital and the know-how that we can bring to bear—we have advantages that few other countries have in terms of managing forests on a sustainable basis—that is growing more wood than we harvest or use or lose to fire, insects or disease.

Many issues, I think, relating to forests are debatable, and some of them are being debated, I am sure, rather energetically today and other places on the Hill. But few would argue that ours can be among the best and most responsibly managed forests in the world, and that if they are, we would relieve the pressure on other countries without the capital, the soils, the know-how, or the will to manage their forests on a sustainable basis.

Given that, we have offered our support to the President's initiative, and my written statement outlines a number of factors that we hope the Senate will consider in carrying it forward. With your permission, I will just summarize a few points from that statement.

TREE PLANTING IS ONLY THE FIRST STEP IN GROWING FORESTS

Tree planting, first, in our view, is only the beginning step in renewing both our urban and our rural forests. Our experience is that growing and caring for trees is a lifelong enterprise and that over the course of decades, landowners not only need energy and patience, they will also need some cash to keep their forests growing.

Therefore, to make the initiative work over the long haul and to achieve the forestry objectives that we would set for it, we feel that we need an economic and tax climate that encourages and permits landowners to maintain their forests. Furthermore, because these same landowners are going to need income to maintain their forests and keep them healthy, we believe they should retain the ability to manage trees for harvest as well as other compatible benefits.

THE AREA OF STRENGTHENING OUR NATION'S OVERALL STEWARDSHIP ETHIC

The second point I would like to offer, Mr. Chairman, is that one of the places where this program can leave an indelible mark, albeit one that may be difficult to measure, is in the area of strengthening our Nation's overall stewardship ethic. It is no surprise to anyone that most Americans are now possibly three generations removed from the land. A stewardship ethic is not something they automatically inherit. We believe that it must be learned. And then it must be nurtured because caring for the environment requires a lifelong commitment that ultimately should be self-generated by people who understand the impact of the choices that they make everyday. For that reason, we have recommended and will continue to support programs that enhance environmental education as well as programs that attempt to instill and enhance a broader and active stewardship ethic on the part of private non-industrial landowners.

WE BELIEVE THE PROGRAMS EMBODIED IN THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE AND THE FORESTRY TITLE OF THE FARM BILL SHOULD BE COORDINATED

Finally, wherever possible, we believe the programs embodied in the President's initiative and the forestry title of the farm bill should be coordinated. We believe they should be aimed at targets that are not generally touched by other efforts, and these targets can and have been identified. And we believe that they should be implemented in such a way that they take advantage of private sector resources and public and private programs already in place.

THE TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE MUST UTILIZE PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

On that note, sir, I would like to end with another view on the whole question of objective setting. Our organization, like Neil Sampson's and others, is engaged in a variety of voluntary activities. We have two that are, I think, notable. One is the American Tree Farm System which enlists 70,000 landowners to manage 95 million acres according to strict standards of good stewardship. The other is an education program which reaches 25,000 teachers a year to help them teach environmental education in the schools. Both are large, but both are almost entirely voluntary programs. It is very difficult to anticipate the outcome of these volunteer programs. But I can assure you that our experience is that the results are phenomenal if you can find ways to first, capture the attention of the American public and then energize them.

EXAMPLE

One example sticks in my mind. I was recently in Ohio visiting the tree farm of a couple named Frank and Avis Newell, an elderly couple who bought some played-out strip mines in central Ohio in 1954–55. Over the ensuing decades they proceeded to plant trees on that land, and today if you walk the land what you see are forests. You see lakes and ponds that are stocked with fish. You see people out there for a day in the woods, on private lands.

But above all, I think you see an extraordinary example of what can be accomplished, though possibly not counted, when ordinary people are mobilized, when they are energized, and if they have willing hands and an eye to the future. For that reason, we support the kind of programs that the President has proposed. Thank you, sir.

Senator KERREY. Thank you, Mr. Wiseman.

[The prepared statement and attachment of Mr. Wiseman follow:]

AMERICAN FOREST COUNCIL

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

of

LAURENCE WISEMAN
PRESIDENT
AMERICAN FOREST COUNCIL

on

THE NATIONAL TREE TRUST ACT OF 1990

before the

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

of the

UNITED STATES SENATE

JULY 24, 1990

Affiliated with the American Paper Institute and the National Forest Products Association

1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW • SUITE 320 • WASHINGTON, DC 20036 • 202 463 2455

Good morning. My name is Larry Wiseman. I am President of the American Forest Council. It is a pleasure to be invited here today to testify on the National Tree Trust Act which would implement the President's Tree Planting Initiative.

The American Forest Council is jointly sponsored by the American Paper Institute and the National Forest Products Association. Together, these associations represent more than 2,500 companies throughout the United States engaged in growing and harvesting timber and manufacturing wood products.

We endorse the goals of the President's Tree Planting Initiative and support the Senate's actions to implement those goals. The Tree Planting Initiative recognizes that both reforestation and afforestation -- reclaiming marginal agricultural lands or restoring forested wetlands, for example -- are important national priorities.

Planting an additional 1.5 million acres of private land annually is an ambitious undertaking. If these are indeed acres that would not otherwise be reforested, it represents a 50 percent increase in reforestation.

As Congress evaluates the President's plan and other proposals to improve and protect our nation's environment and the productivity of forest resources, we suggest the following key points be considered.

I. TREES ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT AND SATISFY IMPORTANT HUMAN NEEDS. DEMANDS FOR THESE RESOURCES ARE GROWING.

Healthy, growing forests provide many benefits. They help maintain wildlife habitat, water quality, and soil productivity. Forests enhance recreation opportunities, and they consume and store carbon -- a major component of greenhouse gases. One acre of trees might grow 4,000 pounds of wood in a year -- and at the same time use almost 6,000 pounds of carbon dioxide and give off 4,280 pounds of oxygen in the process.

Near cities and along streets and next to homes, trees cool the air and provide a quiet place to escape the pressures of urban life.

But forests also provide the wood we need for housing, and the paper we use for packaging, newspapers, and books. The projections made by the U.S. Forest Service in the 1989 RPA Assessment clearly show a substantial increase in demand for all these forest resources over the next five decades.

Domestic demand for wood fiber is projected to increase by approximately 50 percent during this 50-year period. World demand for wood fiber is expected to double. During this same period domestic demand for many forms of forest-related recreation and other noncommodity uses will more than double.

II. THE ADMINISTRATION'S TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE WILL KEEP THE UNITED STATES A WORLD LEADER IN FOREST GROWTH AND RENEWAL.

America's forest have the potential to supply, in an environmentally sound manner, both future domestic demand and increase our competitiveness in world markets. Moreover, this can be accomplished in an environmentally sound manner. We have the soils, climate, technology, capital and the will to manage our forests as well or better than anywhere else in the world.

Worldwide, it behooves us to practice forestry in nations where forests can and will be renewed. With that in mind, it makes good environmental sense to increase growth and productivity on U.S. working forests -- both public and private.

III. INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE IS A POWERFUL FORCE.

Planting trees is a positive action that every individual can personally take to make a direct contribution to the quality of the environment now and for the future.

Many editorial writers have slighted this aspect of the President's Initiative. I would remind them that, in the end, all it really takes to plant a tree is a willing hand and an eye to the future.

Citizen initiative, for example, was the engine that drove FDR's campaign to reclaim the dust bowl. Just 55 years ago, a man named Curtis planted a narrow strip of Austrian pine, red cedar, elm, locust and mulberry trees in central Oklahoma. This was Shelterbelt Number One. And it stands today, with thousands of others, protecting fragile soils from the prairie winds.

People make the difference. In the late 1950's, Frank and Avis Newell bought some played-out strip mines in central Ohio. They made the barren spoil piles a rich, productive forest and converted the pits to lakes. Now their land is teeming with wildlife and rich with fish. And they've harvested their forests to provide lumber and firewood for their neighbors. Altogether, the Newell's forests represent just one of tens of thousands of "fully greened out" examples of how the President's initiative to energize private citizens can help restore the land, provide useful products and endow forests for future generations to enjoy.

IV. TREE PLANTING IS ONLY THE FIRST STEP IN GROWING FORESTS.

The President's Initiative may provide a start, but there can be no doubt that renewing forests is a life-long enterprise. Over the course of decades, landowners will need a lot of energy, a lot of patience and some cash to keep their forests growing.

To make the Initiative work in the long run, therefore, we must assure an economic and tax climate which encourages and permits landowners to maintain their forests.

One way to do that is through a strong forest products industry that provides markets for the products landowners can grow, and thus generates the cash landowners need to maintain their forests and keep them healthy. Hence, no restrictions should be placed on the landowner's ability to manage their trees for income as well as other compatible benefits.

But we also need tax policies that recognize the unique, long-term nature of these forest investments. Equitable capital gains treatment will ensure that landowners retain the income they need to regenerate their forests in the future.

V. THE TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE MUST UTILIZE PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAMS.

We believe the $110 million "Rural Cost Share" portion of the President's tree planting initiative recognizes the need for programs and funding that can be put to work immediately -- by utilizing existing public and private sector efforts.

We fully endorse programs which complement and strengthen -- not duplicate or overlap -- services that are, or should be provided by the private sector. Programs should be organized to follow market forces, and be operated so as not to compete with private sector enterprises like production of seedlings. Hence, in implementing this Initiative, the Forest Service State and Private Program must place administrative emphasis on utilizing the private sector.

One such private sector program is the American Tree Farm System. The Tree Farm system was launched in 1941 by the nation's wood products industries. Now Tree Farm is a nation-wide program encouraging private landowners to produce continuous crops of trees at the same time they improve wildlife habitat, watershed protection, provide outdoor recreation, and protect aesthetic values. The program is operated by 8,000 volunteer foresters from both the public and private sector who work with private landowners in all 50 states.

42-186 O - 91 - 3

Today, with 70,000 Tree Farmers managing in total more than 95 million acres, the Tree Farm System covers more ground than Japan and has grown faster in the last 50 years than the U.S. highway system, the U.S. population or the Federal budget. And it's entirely voluntary.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE INCORPORATED IN THE TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE.

We applaud the intent of the President's $65 million proposal for "Community Reforestation" under the tree planting initiative. The President correctly recognizes the environmental, social, and economic benefits of trees in urban areas.

We further believe the President's dual approach to community reforestation is appropriate. Direct appropriations to the Forest Service for these purposes will strengthen national, state and local delivery systems. And the creation of a national Foundation will harness both funds and citizen energies that would not otherwise be made available to the tree planting initiative.

But, as in rural areas, tree planting is only one step in promoting a better urban environment. A vital parallel step is inculcating a strong stewardship ethic, particularly among young people. *Caring* for the urban environment will require a lifelong commitment -- self-generated by people who understand the impact of the environmental choices they will make everyday.

For that reason, we recommend that programs to enhance environmental education be made a part of the Forest Service's community forestry initiative -- and the activities to be undertaken through the national foundation.

There are numerous existing environmental education programs which, if expanded, could help achieve the goals of the President's community reforestation program. One such program is Project Learning Tree (PLT).

The goal of PLT is to help kindergarten through twelfth grade students become aware of their impact on, and responsibility for the environment. PLT helps students develop the skills and knowledge to make informed decisions regarding the use and management of the environment -- and the confidence to take action on their decisions.

PLT has reached over 250,000 educators and more than 10 million students in 49 states, five Canadian provinces, Sweden, and Finland, since it was written and field tested through a partnership of resource managers and classroom teachers in 1973. Research and field surveys show PLT to be an effective teaching tool. With

additional resources, programs like PLT have the potential to reach several more million students annually.

VII. THE PRESIDENT'S TREE PLANTING INITIATIVE AND THE FORESTRY TITLE OF THE 1990 FARM BILL SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED.

Both the President's Tree Planting Initiative and the proposed Forestry Title of the 1990 Farm Bill seek to enhance the environment and economy of the United States by improving and protecting urban and rural forests. We believe that the approach taken in the House -- to consolidate the two programs -- has merit and should be considered by the Administration and the Senate. We believe that the goals of both the Forestry Title and Tree Planting Initiative can be attained at a total funding level of $175 million.

VIII. THE STEWARDSHIP TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE APPROACH TO ENHANCE RURAL FOREST MANAGEMENT SHOULD BE SUPPORTED.

Congress provided $6 million in the FY 1990 budget to implement the National Association of State Foresters Stewardship Initiative. Central to this initiative is the premise that forest landowners operating without a forest management plan should be targeted for technical assistance. This Stewardship concept is embodied in both the Forestry Title and the President's Tree Planting Initiative. We support the Stewardship approach to encourage management of nonindustrial private forestland.

The National Association of State Foresters (NASF) and AFC have developed the attached resolution which highlights our joint recommendations for how a Stewardship program should be implemented. In summary, AFC and NASF recommend that the Stewardship program: (1) primarily focus on landowners who are not currently managing their lands; (2) ensure private sector participation on state stewardship planning committees; (3) utilize private sector programs and consultants in delivering the stewardship program; (4) encourage stewardship management through technical assistance; and (5) coordinate and complement existing public and private sector landowner assistance efforts.

We recommend that a Stewardship Technical Assistance Program as outlined by the AFC/NASF joint resolution be a part of the consolidated President's Tree Planting Initiative and Forestry Title. We suggest that such a program be funded at $25 million in 1991.

IX. COST SHARE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH EXISTING STRUCTURES.

The forest products industry believes that cost-sharing assistance for tree planting has been effective in putting seedlings in the ground. Subsidized tree planting, however, does not address the long term profitability of forestry. Nor does it provide an effective incentive or the cash flow to manage the trees once they are planted--given that market forces are paramount in forestry investment decisions.

The most critical economic incentive required to encourage forestry on private land is a stable and predictable tax policy that encourages and rewards long term investment in forest productivity and management. Restoration of capital gains tax differential and correcting the current inequity in the passive loss regulations are essential economic requirements for encouraging forest management on private lands.

If cost-share programs are to be part of non-industrial private landowner assistance programs, they should be funded and administered at the state level according to individual state needs. Federal programs designed to initiate and build support for state and private forestry should be turned over to the state for eventual funding support and implementation.

If Congress desires to expand cost share opportunities for private landowners, we strongly recommend new or expanded programs be implemented through existing delivery structures such as FIP or ACP thereby avoiding the creation of duplicative bureaucracies.

X. CONCLUSIONS.

In summary we believe this Committee should recognize the following:

1. A national reforestation and forest management program will enhance the leadership and credibility of the United States on global environmental issues, and make a substantial contribution to the world environment.

2. A national reforestation and forest management program will help ensure that the United States achieves its potential to supply future domestic demand for forest resources.

3. To fully realize the benefits of a national reforestation and forest management program, this nation must provide an economic and tax climate which encourages forest landowners to maintain healthy and growing forests.

4. All programs should complement and strengthen – not duplicate or overlap – services that are, or should be provided by the private sector.

5. All rural assistance programs should utilize existing delivery systems to the maximum extent possible.

6. The Community Reforestation portion of the Tree Planting Initiative would be strengthened by adding a provision for enhancing environmental education.

7. The President's Tree Planting Initiative and the Forestry Title should be consolidated to establish a single national reforestation and forest management program at a funding level of $175 million in 1991. Promoting an environmental ethic and volunteerism in urban areas will take more than planting trees; it begins with education.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify. I will be glad to respond to any questions.

FINAL 4-26-90

AMERICAN FOREST COUNCIL
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FORESTERS

JOINT RESOLUTION ADDRESSING
THE STEWARDSHIP INITIATIVE

The leadership of the American Forest Council (AFC) and the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) have agreed on general principles to effectively and efficiently implement the Stewardship Initiative. The implementation principles stress coordination between the AFC/NASF. They will also serve to ensure that private and public sector efforts complement each other in order to achieve the common goal of improving resource management on non-industrial private forest lands. The implementation principles that have been agreed to are outlined below:

1. AFC and NASF agree that the goals of Stewardship should primarily focus on providing services to landowners who are not currently managing their lands according to a written resource management plan.

This recognizes that the Tree Farm Program does not currently service non-managing landowners, but rather is a recognition program for landowners who have a record of forest resource management. A new initiative, like Stewardship, can most effectively complement existing programs by bringing a management philosophy to non-managing landowners.

2. The State Foresters, through Stewardship, should coordinate landowner assistance efforts provided by the various Federal, state, and county agencies. Stewardship plans should be developed that serve to maximize the delivery of information and services to landowners, minimize duplication of effort and dilution of limited resources, and complement private sector services.

The focus of new financial resources should be toward expanded program support for currently available delivery systems, both public and private.

3. State Foresters should assign priority to providing non-managing landowners with technical assistance workshops, education seminars, publications, and working with resource management services available from the private sector to provide management plan expertise and assistance.

4. Stewardship should encourage and promote forest management to help achieve commodity as well as non-commodity objectives.

5. As landowners build a record of management of the forest resources through the Stewardship Initiative, State Foresters should continue to use the Tree Farm Program as one means of recognition for landowners with a proven record of good stewardship.

The Stewardship Initiative is intended to complement, not replace the Tree Farm System.

6. AFC/NASF will work cooperatively to ensure that funding for Stewardship at the Federal level does not compete with funding for other priority forestry needs.

7. The Federal government role of providing funding for the Stewardship Initiative should be matched by the states for the five year period of the initiative. States should work toward assuming responsibility for the program as it fits their needs.

8. AFC/NASF will encourage public/private sector partnerships to pool resources and funds to achieve common goals. For example, develop cooperative arrangements to support Project Learning Tree (PLT) as a way to extend limited resources and staff.

9. State Foresters should encourage private sector participation on the state Stewardship planning committees. New landowner assistance efforts need to increasingly involve and consider the objectives of those being served if they are to be effective.

Senator KERREY. Let me, Pat, just sort of include everybody in the conversation, if you want to come back up to the table, if you do not mind. And Mr. Crow, could you come back up as well? At this point, I do not think we need to necessarily follow any generally accepted procedures. I hear essentially the answer to the question that I asked concerning the objectives, that there really is not a precise, no net loss forest objective. There is no precise forest objective relating to the generation of new wood products.

The objective seems to be that we are going to try to generate a renewed environmental ethic and try to send a message to not just the American people, which is the first message that you are trying to send out that tree planting is worthwhile and needs to be done, but also to the world as we are trying to engage in other countries, most notably those countries that live in temperate zones, that they need to protect their forests rather than simply clear cutting and harvesting. Is that a fair restatement of the administration's objectives? It is a generalized objective rather than a specific objective although there is 1 billion trees that are being planted rather than a specific underlying principal objective there, you are essentially trying to send a message to Americans and a message to the world. Is that a fair summary?

Ms. KEARNEY. There are multiple objectives and multiple benefits, and we would try to maximize those objectives including the billion tree number, which is the specific number that we use. We think it is a realistic target, an aggressive target but a realistic target.

Senator KERREY. But there is no underlying——

Ms. KEARNEY. And a focal point.

Senator KERREY. But there is no underlying we are going to try to save *x* amount of dollars of energy; we are going to try to reverse some deterioration of nonindustrial forests? There is no underlying conservation objective here other than to say that planting trees saves energy, planting trees is good for the environment. I heard repeatedly in the testimony that we are trying to send an environmental ethic message to the American people, and we are, as well, trying to send a collective message to other nations in the world that we are serious about the preservation of forests.

Ms. KEARNEY. Senator, the objective goes far beyond sending a message. Sending a message is one of the spinoffs. But I think the objective in everything that we focused on is to make this program very action oriented and results oriented and to actually plant the trees. I am not sure whose statement said that when they construct their program, for example, nonprofit groups, they really tried to focus their resources in a prioritized way to actually produce results and get the trees into the ground. Our first priority is actually to get those trees into the ground and do it in the most cost effective but technically correct way. And that really is the major objective that permeates through the organizations with this program.

Senator KERREY. But the results—when you say action and results you are talking about action to get trees planted, 970 million trees in rural areas at 6 to 25 cents a copy, and 30 million in the urban area at $60 to $300 a copy. I mean that is the objective—yes—of the bill?

Ms. KEARNEY. The bottom line objectives, if we had a single goal objectives in each area, yes. But there are many other elements that we will try to build into the program. But the focus is to get the trees planted.

Senator KERREY. But the message is rather important in that you are trying to send—and, again, I have heard in your testimony, Pat, and in others as well, that you are trying to send an environmental message and instill and reinforce, in fact, the President's own words, something about reinstilling the environmental ethic in Americans connected to planting of trees, as well as sending a message to the rest of the world community that we are serious about preservation of forests as opposed to a specific let us try to save $1 billion in energy through this effort over a 10-year period or let us try to measure the loss of forests in nonindustrial private areas and then try to either reverse or try to make incremental progress toward replanting all that; is that correct?

Mr. HUBBARD. Senator, from the State Forester's standpoint, I think that message is important and critical to your reference to no net loss. I do not think 1 billion trees is going to accomplish no net loss either in the rural or the urban areas. But along with that message and that leadership to focus the current attention, I think what we can gain from private sector participation and this may lead us to that no net loss. But that investment of Federal money in itself will not, and should not be expected to.

Mr. WISEMAN. Tree planting per se is a catalytic event, but it is not the only thing that will happen here, we hope. We hope that people will——

Senator KERREY. Tree planting is a catalytic event?

Mr. WISEMAN. Yes, it is the first step in making a forest grow. There is a lot that has to happen between a beginning and the end.

There are some benchmarks, some ways that you can measure how well you are doing in terms of increasing the acreage of private nonindustrial forests that is being managed intelligently according to good principles of stewardship. If, for example, we could increase the number, and we believe that this program will help do this, if we could increase the number of landowners that will actually have a written forest management plan that allows for water quality, streamside management, wildlife habitat, then we will make substantial progress not only in sustaining our forest base, but also improving the quality of that forest base.

Secondly, if as landowners harvest trees, which they will continue to do, they become drawn into this program and as they plant trees begin to think in terms of the broader stewardship management of those lands and again develop a written plan, then I think we will be making substantial progress not, again, toward just sustaining our forest resource but to making it one that will provide economic as well as environmental progress.

Senator KERREY. Are we sending a message through this effort in the private, nonindustrial areas, that 57 percent that is private, nonindustrial area, are we sending a message of an environmental ethic that is comparable to the message that we send through the management of the Forest Service lands? One thing that Mr. Butler raised was a recommendation that we try to eliminate below-cost timber sales. Are we sending a message that is compara-

ble to the message that is being sent in other areas of government behavior?

Mr. HUBBARD. As we have discussed the Forest Stewardship Program here today, the message is that there are multiple benefits, and with a changing landowner base, there are different values that landowners have and what they want to manage their land for. We are sending a message that with America the Beautiful the Federal Government would like to participate in the leadership that would bring to bear on those private lands the kind of multiple benefit directed through a management plan. So ATB is not just to plant trees. It is tied in with the stewardship plan, a stewardship directed message that is more than just planting. We want to maintain and improve and provide for the future.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would support that and disagree with it also. I think to answer your question, you may be sending a message of improvement on the private lands, but you are sending a message of disinterest on the public lands. How can you advocate spending $175 million on improving private industrial and nonindustrial lands when you are proposing a budget which will continue to harvest the public lands at the rate of 10.6 billion board feet a year, and you can continue to harvest the old growth and ancient forests in the Pacific Northwest at the rate of over 60,000 acres per year? You are sending a message of being more interested in planting trees on the private lands than you are in protecting the destruction of trees on the public lands.

Senator KERREY. I am genuinely concerned about that conflicting message. It does not necessarily, by the way, stop the America the Beautiful program. It seems to me, that what is worthy of doing this morning is just simply raising the potential that we are, in fact, if the message to the American people is let us develop a conservation ethic, then we cannot have a conservation ethic on 57 percent of our forested land and for the other 43 percent it is business as usual.

Let me get into some other message problems that I think all of you ought to be concerned about because I see this thing sort of moving forward. Conflicting messages can arise in lots of ways. Based upon what a fellow by the name of Abe Martin once said that when a man tells you that it not the money, it is the principle of the deal, it is likely to be the money. And when all of us tend to live in accordance with an intent to satisfy rational self-interests, it seems to me that the potential in this particular program is that you could be sending some messages out rather quickly. Your action and results oriented, your results could conflict with the environmental ethic message. We have seen government efforts in the past. This would not be the first government program that we try to pump real fast or that we try to set off in some special way that fell on its own sword, that fell on the sword of this understandable need of human beings to satisfy rational self-interests.

I indicated one earlier. I think the citizens would be very upset if they found x amount of dollars going to plant trees that essentially subsidized somebody's desire to be wasteful in the first place which can happen either on private land or on public land. In other words, if I say I am a roadbuilder in the State of Nebraska, let us say, and I decide I am going to plow through a piece of territory

and tear up a bunch of preexisting trees and make no effort to replant in the aftermath, I then make an application for x amount of dollars from this new resource, and the public then finds out about it, the message then becomes much different than the one that you all are suggesting that America the Beautiful can put out.

The message, in short, can be that this program is wasting money. And if the message goes out to the American people this program is wasting money, it will obliterate the environmental objective that you have. I will just guarantee you it will obliterate it just like any other government effort that may be sitting out there with a worthwhile objective, and so I guess my question in general is have you thought through the potential for that kind of conflicting message either at the private level, and I listened to you describe what we are going to do with the private sector. But I am also as much concerned about let us go down to the public sector level and find out what your objectives are.

I do not think that is enough. It seems to me there has to be some sort of grid that is set up to try to prevent an abuse of this new source of money. Otherwise, as I said at the beginning and I say at the end, the need to satisfy rational self-interest is very strong in human beings, and that need could obliterate the very message you are trying to put out, which is, I think, a worthwhile message, and that is to encourage an environmental ethic, which leads me logically, by the way, so that you know where the questioning is going, it leads me logically to consideration of simply trying to fund existing programs where we have set up procedures whereby we can determine whether or not the money is going to be accounted for.

I discussed in private with Mr. Porter when he came over to my office was the possibility of actually funding this Foundation through Governors with an established procedure and guidelines so that you have some elected accountability at the local level anyway.

Mr. SCOVOTTO. Mr. Chairman, let me maybe refocus on one element and that is the urban forest that maybe we are losing it here a little bit. What you are looking at in America the Beautiful from our industry standpoint, what we want to see is the proper material planted in the proper location and long-term maintenance to make sure it survives. And what you see here is, and I would hope, and as the Governor of Nebraska has Trees Across Nebraska, it is a program that the Governors will get behind, and the whole tree planting initiative. But where the cooperation will exist all the way down is through the State foresters and from the U.S. Forest Service in technical advice and information that it can get to a lot of these groups out here that you may find are going to make a decision if that road goes through or not.

And once again from our standpoint it is the only central location that we know of that we will have the availability of technical advice and working with the private sector. And I am talking the nursery industry to make sure that the proper research is done to develop the types of trees that will help the urban forest, and that is cooperation through the State foresters and I will guarantee you the Governors will get behind a lot of programs which will also help in developing an overall grid pattern on what happens on

stewardship of all of our lands. Where most of the people live are in the urban settings anyway, and that is where, you know, a lot of the emphasis is put on this. The rural is very important, but from our industry standpoint, when we look at landscape material, we have to make sure the quality is there because what we are concerned about is if you get a program off and it is bad quality, the trees bad. What happens is you turn people off.

And this is why it is so key for us to develop this overall plan in America the Beautiful to make sure there is continuity there and research and technical assistance from the people who know the best, and it is the U.S. Forest Service through the State foresters with nurseryman input on the type of quality.

Senator KERREY. Why not just block grant the money out to the States? We heard Senator Domenici, with respect, trying to make sure that he was not putting something out here that was going to be in conflict with the administration proposal, propose something that is going to take half a million the first year, half a million the second year, both with the requirement that it be a 50–50 match with $1 million in the succeeding, I think, 3 to 5 years. Did the administration consider the possibility of either on the tree trust side or perhaps even on some of the urban-rural side putting it out to all the States' Governors in a block grant fashion and say we would like to have the private sector participation? We want to leverage State money. We want—because let me put two additional pieces on, again, that we have talked privately about.

One, I got to tell you I am getting increasingly weary as a Representative—I have only been here for almost 2 years—of citizens coming and saying can you help me get some money out of my own Government? Can you help me approach USDA? Can you help me approach the RTC? Can you help me approach the Department of Energy, the Department of Education? I have a grant application in to my own Federal Government. Or the flip side of that is you are constantly on alert wondering whether you are exercising a sufficient amount of oversight over the expenditures.

And so I ask the question for legitimate reasons. It seems to me not only is it if you put it in the hands, discretionary hands, of the Governors in a block grant fashion, do you put the decision of how it is going to be spent at the local level, but you put the responsibility, as well, to account for the resources at the local level. And in this situation, it is going to be much more top down.

Mr. HUBBARD. Senator, I think that is exactly what the proposal is intended to do through State forestry organizations. And all State forestry organizations are tied in with the Governors. And as to block grants to States, this would be money to States. This would be on a cost-share basis that would be administered by an existing delivery system that is very sensitive to showing results and not abuse. We are talking an expansion of that thought a little bit though, and it is not just State forestry organizations by themselves that would be making the decision. It is stewardship committees which involve other agencies to protect the interest of wildlife, of recreation, of soil and water, for the rural trees. And in the urban areas, it is talking about urban forestry councils that bring in the private sector in helping to develop the guidelines of how money would be spent, this includes city mayors. They are invited

to participate, selected mayors from around the country, in setting the guidelines for the urban portion of this program.

Senator KERREY. Mr. Crow, you started to say something?

Mr. CROW. Yes, Senator, I, of course, am a lay person in terms of this science and also in terms of legislation. But I have been around the track a lot of times, and I would testify to you that this tree trust bill is the only way I can conceive of that what will happen because of it would ever happen. It is the only way that you will pull together the dynamic actions of all these separate committees and all the cities of America to plant trees for trees' sake. Many side advantages, including economic which have not been discussed today. The economic potential is a multiple itself. As far as matching grants is concerned on the tree trust, I promise you we will beat 10 for 1, and I would even say give us a decade, and we will make it 20 and 30 to 1 in terms of the cost to the Government, in terms of what we generate—as I say that, I realize I am understating it now—what we will generate in the way of stimulated public enthusiastic action in planting trees in the cities and on the highways of America.

Senator KERREY. Did you want to say something, Pat?

Ms. KEARNEY. I would just reinforce that your question is a very good question. And it is something we have thought a lot about. We built accountability into the system at every level. Most of the moneys, for example, that will be allocated for the community trees portion of this program would go to the Forest Service. The bulk of that will go directly back out to the States to the State foresters through the State and private forestry network. So that money will go to the States and then be matched. This will produce an increase in funds. Most of it will go to the States where the accountability will be. But there are some definite benefits to having the national level program, which will help develop the momentum and help develop some generic materials and technical assistance tools that basically will save time and money so each State will not have to do that.

And that coordinating activity will be a benefit to the State and actually facilitate and catalyze what the States are doing. So it is a process of building what will be one of the largest coalitions in the history of this country when you think of the numbers of groups and organizations that will potentially participate in this.

Senator KERREY. Let me walk through this then a little bit. Now let us say the thing is on the books, and we have America the Beautiful rolling. Now comes Mr. Jones from Hebron, Nebraska, and Mr. Jones calls me up in my Washington office because he assumes that a Senator should have some responsibility over this particular program, perhaps incorrectly, as I have observed my influence over the bureaucracies of government, but nonetheless he comes and says I would like to have some help. I have 100 acres of land here, and I have approached my State forester, and he has been uncooperative in helping me get this thing done. I have talked to the Governor's office, and I get nowhere there. I have approached the State nurserymen's association, and I get no relief there. I cannot get any answers. Why cannot I plant, get some assistance and participate in this program to plant 100 acres of private land?

42-186 O - 91 - 4

What sort of thing do you envision occurring at that point? Who am I going to call and what kind of Q&A is going to occur at that point to discover whether or not this individual has been correctly or incorrectly treated at the local level?

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I think that always can happen anywhere, but I think in most cases you will find that when a person wants to plant his land working through the State forester's office, that will happen. He will get the advice and information. If you are not satisfied, you can come to the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. We will follow up on that. There is a process. As Mr. Hubbard said, the mechanism is in place to make this all happen. We have oversight responsibilities in working with the State foresters to see that they do carry out those programs.

Senator KERREY. But the reason I keep pushing on this, the objective, I mean is the objective—the guy says I just want to plant 100 acres of trees. Now what is wrong with that? Are there principles that guide? You suggested that there is going to be a technical team put together with SCS and ASCS and forestry people and so forth—I do not remember all of the folks—and some private sector people on it that are going to be doing some analysis. Is the individual going to have to, is that going to be a panel that he is going to have to approach to get permission to do it? I mean what guides the decision to say no or what guides the decision to say yes?

Ms. KEARNEY. Hopefully your constituent would not have to come to you except to say that he is pleased about the program, but if there was a problem, obviously they could be put in contact with the U.S. Forest Service, and they would immediately go back to the field and see what the problem was and why it was not handled there, and also talk with the private sector cooperators. What would happen on the local level in the rural program would be that the landowner would contact the ASCS office or the local Forest Service office because we will have a memorandum of understanding in terms of the administration of the rural tree component with ASCS. Those would be the two key offices, and Soil Conservation Service would also be involved in this.

They would contact that office and say I want to plant some land. The technical team of people then would go out and on site look at the lands, talk with the landowner, make a determination as to what is appropriate, what is suitable, and what could be done for the various kinds of land.

Senator KERREY. What are the factors that determine appropriateness and suitability?

Ms. KEARNEY. They would look at the quality of land. Is it suitable for planting trees?

Senator KERREY. You are doing a soils analysis then? Is that essentially what is driving this whole thing? Is there——

Ms. KEARNEY. No, there——

Mr. WEST. Maybe Tony could answer that. He has been working on the specific criteria.

Senator KERREY. I understand $175 does not hit all the demand. Every person that has testified has testified to that. The demand exceeds the supply. Is that a fair statement? And so if the demand exceeds the supply, there is going to be people to whom the answer is going to be no. And what I am trying to ascertain is is it going to

be made on the basis of soil, on the basis of political influence, on the basis of me trying to convince the majority of the tree trust board to go along? What do I have to do now to get this thing done?

Mr. DORRELL. I am going to start.

Senator KERREY. Which is again why I am suggesting that perhaps energy conservation or some other measurement be used because obviously we have a lot of land out there that does not have trees on it. And if I conclude that it is going to increase the economic value of my property to get trees on there, and if I conclude that there is a pile of money available somewhere that I can get, I am going to go after that pile of money to assist me in planting the trees.

Mr. DORRELL. I am going to start, and I think Jim Hubbard here will finish how we work on this sort of thing. I would make a point, first, Mr. Chairman. We are not starting from scratch with this program. We have been planting trees with the Forestry Incentives Program and the Agricultural Conservation Program, and for the last 5 years the Conservation Reserve Program. So our people in the field, both Federal, USDA and State and others are used to working together and have some pretty good procedures worked out.

And essentially what we try to do is get the private landowners' interests reflected and their personal goals and objectives transmitted and communicated to our people so that they, in turn, can give professional advice and assistance in what programs they are eligible for, what they need to do to satisfy our requirements, and that sort of thing. So it is sort of give and take and a planning negotiation between the Government and its cooperators and the individual private landowners to get what is right for that piece of ground. And we tried not to establish at the Federal level too many constraints or restrictions. We will require that there be a plan without saying in great detail what should go into a plan. And we let the State foresters and others take over and talk about the details, whether or not certain amounts of rainfall are required or soil conditions and that sort of thing.

I would like Jim to comment on our new stewardship program and how this planning is taking place on the ground because I think that is the key and that is what the future is and not the past.

Mr. HUBBARD. I am going to practice a little bit of rational self-interest. I think what you should do is call your State forester, Gary Hergenrader, and ask him for an explanation on that issue, and I think that is what should happen in every State. Even though the State foresters are going to share this program effort with a number of other interests and individuals to help develop guidelines, I would still in your position hold that State forester responsible if this becomes a State and private forestry program that uses the existing delivery system.

That is why I also mentioned that I think it is important the guideline developments stay with the Forest Service. We have a number of options. We have guidelines in Forest Incentive, in Conservation Reserve, in Agricultural Conservation Program. We have guidelines in stewardship. Now which direction America the Beau-

tiful takes in rural trees is still to be determined and then we will decide which of those guidelines to apply. But again it will be general at the Federal level, specific at the State, and we will let those State groups, the urban forestry councils for the urban component and the stewardship committees for the rural component, determine what the specifics for that State will be.

And in some cases, it will be site productivity. In some cases it will be wildlife habitat, a number of different values that could be managed for. In all cases, it will require direction from a management plan.

Senator KERREY. Let us talk about the Tree Trust Foundation just for a little bit? Why not establish six regional tree trust foundations in the United States all based upon the same principles that Mr. Crow you have talked about, the ability to be able to raise private money? Why not encourage States to set up their own private foundations to do it the same? Is it not going to be difficult for you to get geographical distribution for this particular Foundation?

Mr. CROW. There are two sides to it. One is bringing in the funds. Then the other is using the funds. As far as bringing the funds in, I will just say absolutely it will be much simpler, much more successful to do it on a national basis than it would on a regional basis. Just to give you a picture, for instance, I might be able to go to the chairman of Exxon and say, describe the program and say would it not be good for you to make a $5 million contribution to this fund this year, and maybe agree to $1 million a year for the next 10 years, for the image that it would give you. I would have a chance. A regional person would not have a chance on such as an approach as that.

Most of the big, big gifts, big, big support are going to be nationally oriented and not regionally oriented. Then, as far as putting the program out, I think your question has to be answered by saying very likely so. However, there already exists a well-established, enthusiastic bodies of groups that have one purpose in mind. That is planting trees in their community. They are mostly oriented to larger and exist in the larger cities, and they are not State oriented. They are city oriented.

It would be part of our program, to the extent that I have the influence on the program, that we would move out from the big cities into the rural areas and into the small communities for the work on smaller roads and highways and in the small cities as well. Senator, I am sure that this can best be done successfully by a national foundation. Be there a need for regionals' work, they would best be done sub the national.

Senator KERREY. Are their articles of incorporation already drawn for the Tree Trust Foundation? Are there provisions in the articles that would permit you to engage in policy recommendations, national policy recommendations?

Mr. CROW. There would be articles in the Foundation—I have to ask—tell you I have not read the articles of the corporation, but I am confident, absolutely certain, that all of the protective and appropriate provisions to preclude political activities are in there. I know that is the case if that is the answer to your question.

Senator KERREY. Well, actually I would prefer that it be permitted to take an advocacy position. But obviously, or perhaps not ob-

viously, I would prefer that it not be permitted to participate in electoral politics, which I would be shocked if it permitted that. But for the Tree Trust Foundation to be able to advocate particularly consistent with what I hear to be the objective—again, I reinforce what I hear— what I hear to be the objective is one of sending a message both to the American people and a message to the world, as well, about the United States interest in preserving and developing forests, it seems to me that advocacy for policy development would be appropriate for the Foundation. Is that your understanding or not?

Mr. CROW. You are right about the provision. There is a restriction against political activity. Now advocacy, certainly the Foundation's biggest tool is going to be competent quality dissemination of this message. That will involve advocacy. That will involve strong and multiple local and perhaps regional and statewide participation by subgroups. If selling the idea of trees is—I think advocacy is a better word than politics—there will be no politics to it. There will be considerable advocacy of it. Might be a little competition between Dallas Fort Worth. That is not politics though. [Laughter.]

Senator KERREY. Unless you are the mayor of Dallas. The question is directed at whether or not the Foundation will, let us say for example, take a position on an old growth?

Mr. CROW. On no growth?

Senator KERREY. On old-growth forests. Will it take a position on it that says that we are trying to send a message here? I just use it as an example. But there are examples that will come up of a policy issue that might put you in conflict with elected officials such as myself.

Mr. CROW. Senator Kerrey, the Foundation will have no position outside of planting trees, promoting and planting trees, proper trees, more of them the better. But we would not have any, express any judgment on matters that do not concern our specific charge. And that is getting the trees in the ground.

Senator KERREY. So we assume then that the articles expressly prohibit participation and advocacy of any kind of a policy? It could be at the Federal level. It could be at the local level where, let us say, a street widening project were to take trees out, and a local, one of these local efforts, and I do not remember all the ones that you cited, but I can see a situation where you could have a local tree planting foundation would come and actually request assistance in blocking that effort. The tree trust would be expressly prohibited from participating in that kind of activity?

Mr. CROW. Sir, I do not know the provisions of it. But I will tell you if I am concerned, the tree trust will have no position on widening roads, no position on things like that. We will have one position, and that is let us plant more trees. We might say if you cut those down, you have to go plant some more or something like that. But we would have no involvement in affairs other than our specific charge.

Senator KERREY. I am not familiar with the details of it, but I assume that the administration has given careful thought to the method by which people are selected for this board similar to, and again, Senator Domenici implied in a very brief presentation that he made for his Foundation?

Ms. KEARNEY. Senator, if I may respond to your first question and then the second. As far as lobbying or influencing policy, in section 105 of the proposed bill, I cannot answer to the articles of incorporation of Mr. Crow's foundation—but the Foundation that is designed by the President shall not engage in lobbying or propaganda for the purpose of influencing legislation and shall not participate or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office. So it is clearly stated that this is not to be a lobbying organization to influence policy. It is explicitly for purposes of tree planting.

Your second question, there is no stipulation in the bill as to exactly what the board would be. The President would designate a Foundation. The private Foundation will compose their board and pick appropriate people that are very well qualified.

Senator KERREY. So there is no provision for geographical distribution, no provision for any other participation other than just the President making a decision about who is going to be on the board?

Mr. CROW. I do not know of any. The President has not designated me. I may not be involved. It is my hope and intent to be.

Senator KERREY. I suspect with the thought that you can get from 30 to 1,000 to 1 match that will be included in the list. But, again, do you think it is reasonable that there be some consideration given to geographical distribution or other sorts of considerations on this particular board?

Mr. CROW. It seems to me that it would be logical that it would be, yes, sir. I do not think things have gotten to that, but that makes sense.

Senator KERREY. I guess the general concern that I have is trying to project this thing out 4 or 5 years in the future and thinking about how individuals that have a piece of property and they are trying to get it forested. The guide seems to be just simply we are going to plant trees, period. And if the technical aspects measure up, we will plant them, period.

Mr. CROW. That is very different. There are two distinct groups, sections of this, and ours is very circumscribed as compared to the more generalities that apply to the industrial and private lands.

Senator KERREY. How do you see yours as being more circumscribed?

Mr. CROW. Well, we will plant trees in cities and on highways.

Senator KERREY. The underlying assumptions are essentially the same; are they not? You are looking at planting trees, period? If I have planted a tree, I am successful? If I get 1 billion trees planted I am successful independent of any other considerations?

Mr. CROW. That is right for our side, not for theirs. The tree for its own sake. And then there is all the other advantages also.

Mr. HUBBARD. Senator Kerrey, even in the urban areas, though, we would hope that is done by a plan, a plan that sets out an objective that prescribes maintenance, that says why you want trees planted in this place.

Senator KERREY. Who is going to participate in the development of the plan and the objective then?

Mr. HUBBARD. State Foresters envision that the urban forestry councils that are established in each State will set the guidelines for the objective of the program for that State, and that the State

forestry agencies or private consultants will be developing those plans for individual communities. And the same on the rural. For the landowners it will be a State stewardship committee that says for the State of Colorado, for the State of Nebraska, these are overall objectives consistent with national guidelines for accomplishing rural tree planting. And for an individual landowner, that landowner will have to have a plan that says what their objective is. Their objective may be timber production. It may be wildlife habitat. It may be forest health. But it will have to have an objective that says this is why we are planting trees and this is how we intend to follow up to nurture those trees to maturity to accomplish that objective.

Senator KERREY. But again, for the seventh or eight time, there is no hook that says that one of the objectives is a clear conservation objective measured against where we are and where we would like to be, no energy conservation hook that says that we are trying to make some—it is essentially technical questioning of whether or not the trees can be planted and the success will be measured whether or not we have planted *x* number. In this particular case, it is $1 billion broken down by each category. If we plant all those trees we are successful. And I am suggesting to you that the public will have other measurements, and if I own property A and property B gets planted, I will say the program is unsuccessful. And so there is going to be competition for the resources. And as I said, I reinforce the thought that there ought to be, it seems to me, some sort of unifying aspects other than just the object of planting more trees.

Ms. KEARNEY. Senator, if I might elaborate a little bit on the two mechanisms. The trees that will be planted in the rural area will be generated by the technical assistance team working with the landowner. There will be a set of criteria that has been established by this team of people in terms of what are the priorities and what are the kinds of things that they are going to work on with the landowner to incorporate in this management plan. Those landowners and those parcels of land that can meet most of those criteria would be eligible. If there were competition for these funds and if the resources became scarce for rural tree planting, then those lands that would meet all of the criteria for the program would be priority parcels of land to participate in the program.

And that mechanism really would build upon the existing administrative structure that we have in the Department of Agriculture presently, and working with the State foresters. When a Foundation is designated, the board of advisers, the board of the Foundation, they will not really reach into this rural tree planting aspects. That will be a separate organizational mechanism that will be in place. They will work with some of the similar people at the State level, but they will target their attention to community trees and volunteer partnerships. So it will really be a different angle that they will focus all their energies and moneys on.

So administratively they blend and overlap to some degree in terms of expertise, but administratively you have two structures to carry out the program on the ground.

Senator KERREY. I am being called to a vote. We will conclude the hearing. I want to say that I appreciate you all taking the time

to come over. I do have some written questions that I would submit for answers.

[Questions submitted by Senator Kerrey and S. 2426, the National Tree Trust Act of 1990, follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

September 18, 1990

The Honorable Patrick J. Leahy
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture
Nutrition, and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In response to your letter of August 6, we are enclosing our responses to the questions from Senator Kerrey regarding S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990."

Again, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to work with you on this key piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

John L. Evans

JOHN L. EVANS
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Natural Resources and Environment

Enclosure

USDA Response to Questions Submitted by Senator J. Robert Kerrey
Regarding S. 2426, the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990"

1. Has the USDA determined the rate of deforestation in the U.S. in terms of wooded acres lost annually? Please break the figures down for federal lands, private lands and non-federal lands.

In 1620, there were an estimated 1 billion acres of forest land in what is now the United States. By 1987, forest land in this country had been reduced to 731 million acres. Of that total, approximately 253 million acres are federally managed. The recent trend in rural areas indicates that the rate of conversion of privately owned forest land to other uses may be slowing down.

According to the most recent USDA Forest Service RPA assessment, the Nation's forest land base (731 million acres) will be reduced by 28 million acres (approximately 4 percent) over the next 50 years, primarily due to continued conversions of adjacent rural land associated with an expanding population concentrated in urban areas.

The best available information on urban and community forests indicates that approximately 70 million acres of forest cover exist within cities and towns. However, in our cities and towns, there is a trend toward rapid deforestation, with only one tree being planted for every four that die or are removed.

2. Has any effort been undertaken to ensure that at the end of a five year period -- five billion trees later -- that there will be a net gain in the number of trees? Has the Administration moved to consider how this initiative to increase the overall number of trees may be undermined by federal action in other areas: highway construction, poor forest service planning, etc.?

As mentioned above, the long-term trend is for a slight decrease in forest land over the next 50 years. The President's proposed program would result in planting trees on about 1.5 million acres annually for the next 5 years. During the 5-year period, that rate of planting would result in a net gain in forest land. An important component of the President's proposal is heightening attention and awareness about the value of a forest land base. This could result in better planning for local development and urban expansion that includes sustaining forest cover, thus dramatically changing the projected trend.

3. Would not some of the proposed funds be better leveraged at protecting many of the lands already forested, to ensure that they stay that way?

Much of the publicity about the President's proposed program has focused on "planting a billion trees." The actual proposal provides for planting, maintaining, and improving 1 billion trees. In other words, the proposal does call for a greatly strengthened assistance program for improving the management and vigor of existing forests, in both rural areas and communities.

Currently, only one of ten rural landowners seeks professional assistance before trees are harvested. As a result, little provision is made for reforesting the land or for ensuring that the forest stand is managed for a sustained yield over time. Protection of fragile soils, water quality, wildlife, and other forest-based resources is frequently not addressed. In its most recent inventory, the USDA Soil Conservation Service indicates that more than half of the non-Federal rural forest land is in need of some conservation treatment. Through both increased technical assistance and cost sharing incentives for forest improvement practices, landowners will be able to better manage and maintain existing forests for the multiple benefits they provide.

4. I don't disagree with planting trees, nor of the importance of volunteerism and private and local efforts. However, why do we need a federally funded foundation?

It is envisioned the foundation would be able to develop funding amounts and sources far in excess of the original grant. Current estimates from the American Forestry Association place the actual need for funding in the 6- to 18-billion dollar range depending upon the costs of tree planting in individual communities. The current estimate of the "unit cost" of planting and caring for an urban tree in large cities is $465. The foundation will be able to make grants directly to tree planting groups and local governments to purchase trees, provide for administrative support, etc. This type of grant is less restrictive than the technical assistance provided for under the USDA's Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act.

5. Describe the foundation's proposed activity. How will a local entity apply for assistance? What type of a process do you foresee?

The President will designate a foundation that will best be able to meet the purposes outlined in the legislation. It will be up to that foundation, when it is designated, to establish the application guidelines using the act as guidance. The foundation will develop consistent, basic criteria which ensures an applicant's ability to responsibly organize, plant, and maintain its proposed planting projects.

The foundation will work as a catalyst to forge new partnerships between individuals, businesses, governments, and community organizations. It will promote public awareness and a spirit of volunteerism, encourage private sector contributions, and oversee the use of these contributions to encourage tree planting projects in America's communities.

6. **What is the basis for the $35m estimate for the Foundation? How was this figure derived? Since the Senate and House have authorized the Foundation at $25m could you explain what is the basis of this number and what aspects of the Foundation were cut in order to reach this number.**

The original amount needed for the foundation was based on the assumption that it would need operational expenses for 5 years as well as beginning a modest grant program to begin supporting local tree planting and care efforts. After that time, the foundation would be able to support itself from donations. With the administrative costs being covered and a granting program under way, the foundation will become effective immediately.

The reduction of $10 million will require the foundation to become self sustaining at an earlier time.

7. **How do you propose to spend the $25m? What size staff is envisioned for the foundation? Who will the staff report to? How much of the total do you propose to allocate to fund raising efforts? Will the Foundation be located in Washington D.C. or at locations throughout the country?**

This one-time grant may be placed in an interest bearing account under dispersal/audit requirements and other restrictions established by the legislation. It is expected the entire amount of the grant will be expended in an effort to begin effective operations as soon as possible.

It is envisioned there will be an executive director accountable to the board for the day-to-day operation of the foundation, but the size of the staff and the organizational structure have not been decided at this time. There will be an early need for public relations expertise to increase public awarness and provide for an educated public at the grassroots level. Acquiring the expertise necessary to accomplish this ambitious undertaking will be an early goal of the staff.

Because of its need to closely coordinate with the USDA Forest Service and other national cooperators in "America the Beautiful", it is envisioned an office will be maintained in the Washington, D.C., area. Again, depending upon the yet to be established internal organization of the foundation and the establishment of procedures for making grants, a decision on the possible location of other offices has not been made.

8. Who will develop the application for the program, make the funding decisions and distribute funds?

The funds will be distributed in accord with the disbursement and audit criteria established in the legislation. The application and funding decision procedures are yet to be established. It is envisioned the application program will be developed after consultation with the USDA Forest Service, American Forestry Association, National Arbor Day Foundation, and other current leaders in the field of professional urban and community forestry. Input from groups that would be eligible for the grants would also be sought out.

The decision process for who would receive the grants would be created by much the same kind of group to assure there was someone with current state-of-the-art knowledge in the field available to evaluate the grant applications.

9. What will be the interaction between the Foundation and the USDA in determining funding priorities for the founoation's work? Who will have the final say if differences of opinion arise?

At the present time, it is envisioned the foundation will work closely with the USDA Forest Service, including guidance on technical forestry issues and audit standards as required by the legislation. However, the foundation will need to be independent of the Forest Service and others in matters of policy and program emphasis. This will ensure there is no conflict of interest between the foundation and any agent of the U.S. Government.

There will also be close ties between the foundation and all members of the urban forestry community to seek guidance and advice on matters pertaining to policy and program priorities. The roles of the Federal and State Governments and the foundation are different. The agencies provide technical assistance and this is limited to the scope of their enabling legislation, while the foundation has another role. It is difficult to envision where differences of opinion could arrise when each sticks to its role as prescribed by the legislation.

10. Who will be eligible to participate and receive funding? What would be the requirements for participation?

During our contacts with community and national groups in developing the legislative proposal it was envisioned that the broadest possible eligibility criteria would be established. Community tree planting groups, national and local service clubs, community and city governments, national non-profit forestry and conservation groups, etc., all would be eligible. We have had recent advice from a wide variety of concerned groups that a plan for the care and maintenance of trees being planted be one of the criteria established. However, at this time, none has been developed.

This would be one of the areas the foundation would need to consult with its partners in the urban forestry community to assure quality grants were made.

11. How long will the foundation exist?

The foundation, once selected, will continue to exist as long as there is a need to fund tree planting efforts in our country. However, there will be only a one-time grant from the Federal Government.

12. How will the foundation's effectiveness be determined? How will the initiative's effectiveness in meeting the tree planting goals be determined?

It is expected the foundation will measure its success both by the number of urban trees planted that have a plan for their care and maintenance and by the number of effective volunteer oriented community based tree groups that become established. For example, one measure will be the number of cities, towns, counties, and municipalities that qualify to become a "Tree City USA."

Ultimately the "market place" or feedback from groups receiving funds for tree planting will be the measure of the effectiveness of the foundation. They will be able to communicate directly with the board of directors on these matters.

II

101ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2426

To authorize the President to designate a private nonprofit foundation as eligible to receive funds for the purpose of promoting community tree planting and cultivation projects, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a rural tree planting program and a community tree planting program, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 23), 1990

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GARN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BOND, Mr. COATES, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. ADAMS) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

---

A BILL

To authorize the President to designate a private nonprofit foundation as eligible to receive funds for the purpose of promoting community tree planting and cultivation projects, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a rural tree planting program and a community tree planting program, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Tree Trust Act of 1990".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) trees and forests provide beauty and diversity to both rural and urban landscapes;

(2) trees and forests protect the Nation's soil, water, and wetland resources by filtering runoff and preventing erosion;

(3) trees and forests provide food and cover for many species of wildlife;

(4) trees and forests capture and safely store greenhouse gases, thereby reducing the possibility of global climate change;

(5) trees and forests provide shade, block winds, and add moisture to the air, thereby mitigating the urban "heat island" effect and significantly reducing energy use;

(6) trees and forests make important contributions to the environmental, social, and economic well-being of both rural and urban areas across the Nation; and

(7) stewardship of trees and forests could be significantly enhanced by encouraging, promoting, and supporting partnerships and community service projects

involving individuals, organizations, businesses and governments at all levels.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) authorize the President to designate a private nonprofit foundation as eligible for a one-time grant from the Secretary of Agriculture, to be used for promoting public awareness and a spirit of volunteerism, soliciting private sector contributions, and overseeing the use of these contributions to encourage tree planting projects in communities and urban areas;

(2) promote the principles of basic forest stewardship through the nationwide planting, improvement, and maintenance of trees in order to increase reforestation, enhance the environmental and aesthetic qualities of our Nation's rural and urban areas, and reduce global carbon dioxide levels;

(3) authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide increased financial and technical assistance to State forestry agencies and others, and enter into cost sharing agreements with individuals, for the purpose of encouraging owners of nonindustrial private lands to plant and maintain trees and improve forests in rural areas; and

(4) authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide increased financial and technical assistance to State forestry agencies and others for the purpose of encouraging units of local government, civic groups, and individuals to plant and maintain trees and improve forests in communities and urban areas.

TITLE I—NATIONAL TREE TRUST

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The intent of this title is to provide for a grant to a private nonprofit Foundation to be used for the following purposes:

(1) To promote public awareness and a spirit of volunteerism in support of tree planting and cultivation projects in communities and urban areas nationwide.

(2) To solicit private sector contributions through the mobilization of individuals, businesses, governments and community organizations with the goal of increasing the number of trees planted in communities and urban environments.

(3) To accept and administer private gifts and make grants, including matching grants to encourge local participation, for the planting and cultivating of trees.

(4) To ensure that our descendants will be able to share their ancestors' pride when referring to their land as America the Beautiful.

SEC. 102. AUTHORITY.

(a) The President is authorized to designate a private nonprofit organization, which for purposes of this title shall be referred to as the "Foundation", as eligible to receive funds pursuant to section 104(a) of this title, upon determining that such organization can, consistent with its charter, carry out the purposes stated in section 101 of this title, and that the officers of such organization have the experience and expertise necessary to direct the activities of the organization.

(b) Nothing in this title shall be construed to make the Foundation an agency or instrumentality of the United States Government, or to make officers, employees, or members of the board of directors of the Foundation officers or employees of the United States.

SEC. 103. FUNDING.

In fiscal year 1991, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make a grant, from funds authorized to be appropriated under title III of this Act, of not to exceed $35,000,000 to the Foundation designated pursuant to section 102.

SEC. 104. GRANT.

(a) Funds made available pursuant to section 103 of this title shall be granted to the Foundation by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) to enable the Foundation to carry out the purposes specified in section 101 of this title; and

(2) for the administrative expenses of the Foundation.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Foundation may hold grant funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section in interest-bearing accounts, prior to the disbursement of such funds for purposes specified in section 101 of this title, and may retain for such program purposes any interest earned on such deposits.

SEC. 105. ELIGIBILITY OF THE FOUNDATION FOR A GRANT.

(a) A grant may be made to the Foundation under this Act only if the Foundation agrees to comply with the requirements specified in this title.

(b) The Foundation may use funds provided by this Act only for programs and projects which are consistent with the purposes specified in section 101 of this title.

(c) Officers and employees of the Foundation may not receive any salary or other compensation for services rendered to the Foundation from any source other than the Foundation.

(d) The Foundation shall not issue any shares of stock or declare or pay any dividends.

(e) No part of the funds of the Foundation shall inure to the benefit of any board member, officer, or employee of the Foundation, except as salary or reasonable compensation for services or expenses. Compensation for board members shall be limited to reimbursement for reasonable costs of travel and expenses. No director, officer, or employee of the Foundation shall participate, directly or indirectly, in the consideration or determination of any question before the Foundation affecting his or her financial interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, entity, or organization in which he or she is an officer, director, or trustee, or in which he or she has any direct or indirect financial interest.

(f) The Foundation shall not engage in lobbying or propaganda for the purpose of influencing legislation and shall not participate or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

(g) For the fiscal year in which the Foundation receives the grant awarded under section 104(a) of this title, and for the succeeding five fiscal years, the accounts of the Foundation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other

political subdivision of the United States. The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by subsection (j) of this section.

(h) The financial transactions undertaken pursuant to this title by the Foundation may be audited by any agency designated by the President for the fiscal year in which the Foundation receives the grant awarded under section 104(a) and for the five succeeding fiscal years.

(i) The Foundation shall ensure—

(1) that each recipient of assistance provided through the Foundation under this Act keeps, for five years after the receipt of such assistance, separate accounts with respect to such assistance and such records as may be reasonably necessary to disclose fully the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit; and

(2) that the Foundation, the agency designated by the President pursuant to subsection (h) of this section, or any of the Foundation's duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and ex-

amination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance provided through the Foundation under this title.

(j) Not later than three months after the conclusion of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall publish an annual report for the preceding fiscal year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Foundation's operation, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this Act. The Foundation's obligation to publish annual reports pursuant to this subsection shall terminate after publication of the report incorporating the findings of the final audit required by subsection (g) of this section.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR TREE PLANTING AND FOREST IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 201. RURAL TREE PLANTING AND FOREST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a rural tree planting and forest improvement program as a special component of the Rural Forestry Assistance Program under section 3 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2102). In implementing this section, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial, technical, and related assistance to State foresters and others for the purpose of assisting nonindustrial private landowners plant, maintain, and improve trees and forests in rural areas. As-

sistance provided by the Secretary under this section shall emphasize tree planting and forest improvement practices designed to prevent soil erosion, enhance aesthetics and recreational opportunities, improve wildlife habitat, increase timber supplies, reduce the possibility of global climate change, and provide other environmental and economic benefits.

SEC. 202. COMMUNITY TREE PLANTING AND FOREST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a community tree planting and improvement program as a special component of the Urban Forestry Assistance Program under section 6 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2105). In implementing this section, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide financial, technical, and related assistance to State foresters and others for the purpose of assisting units of local government, civic organizations, and individuals to plant, maintain, and improve trees and forests in communities and urban areas. Assistance provided by the Secretary under this section shall emphasize tree planting and forest improvement practices designed to improve the efficiency of energy use, enhance aesthetics and recreational opportunities, improve wildlife habitat, moderate temperature extremes, reduce the possibility of global climate change, and provide other general environ-

mental benefits that contribute to social well-being and sense of community.

SEC. 203. COST SHARING.

(a) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to develop and implement a program to encourage the planting, development, management, and protection of trees on nonindustrial private lands. The purposes of such program shall be to encourage landowners to apply practices that will provide for planting of trees on and afforestation of suitable open lands, reforestation of cutover or other nonstocked or understocked forest lands, tree stand improvement practices, including thinning, prescribed burning, and other silvicultural treatments, and forest resources management and protection, so as to provide for the production and maintenance of trees and other forest resources associated therewith.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "nonindustrial private land" means nonpublic land suitable for the planting or cultivation of trees and owned by any private individual, group, Indian tribe or other native group, association, corporation, or other legal entity.

(c) Landowners shall be eligible for cost sharing under this program if they own one thousand acres or less of private forest land, except that the Secretary may approve cost sharing with landowners owning more than one thousand acres of

such land if the Secretary determines that significant public benefits will accrue. In no case, however, may the Secretary approve cost sharing with landowners owning more than five thousand acres of private forest land.

(d) In such regulations as the Secretary may promulgate to implement this title, the Secretary shall include guidelines for the administration of this section and shall identify the measures and activities eligible for cost sharing under this section.

(e) Individual tree cultivation and management plans developed by the landowner shall be the basis for agreements between the landowner and the Secretary under this section. Such plans may, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, be developed in cooperation with, and be approved by, the State Forester or equivalent State or local official. The Secretary shall encourage use of private professional forestry or tree cultivation agencies, consultants, organizations, and firms to the extent feasible for the preparation of individual tree cultivation and management plans.

(f) In return for the agreement by the landowner, the Secretary shall agree to share the cost or implementing those practices and measures set forth in the agreement for which the Secretary determines that cost sharing is appropriate. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that portion that the Secretary determines is necessary

and appropriate to implement the practices and measures under the agreement, but not more than 75 per centum of the actual costs incurred by the landowner. The maximum amount any individual may receive annually under the program authorized by this section shall be determined by the Secretary by regulation.

(g) The Secretary shall, for the purpose of this title, allocate funds available for cost sharing among the States after assessing the public benefit incident thereto, and after giving appropriate consideration to the acreage of private land in each State suitable for the cultivation of trees, the number of ownerships eligible for cost sharing in each State, and the need for tree planting, reforestation, tree stand improvement, or other tree cultivation or maintenance investments on such ownerships.

(h) The Secretary may, if the Secretary determines that doing so will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the program authorized by this section, use an advertising and bid procedure in determining the persons or lands in any area to be covered by agreements under this section.

SEC. 204. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) In carrying out this title the Secretary may utilize such of the authority provided in section 10 of the Coopera-

tive Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2109) as the Secretary may deem appropriate and practicable.

(b) The Secretary may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

There is authorized to be appropriated $175,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991 through 1995 to carry out the provisions of this Act. Of the amount appropriated under this title for fiscal year 1991, $35,000,000 shall be used to fund a grant from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Foundation pursuant to section 103 of this Act. All funds appropriated under this title shall remain available until expended.

○

Senator KERREY. Let me summarize my feelings at the moment. One is that as far as the world message is concerned, I think that is going to be dependent not just upon our planting of trees, but upon our overall policy. The world community, specifically Brazil for example, is going to be influenced, not just by are we planting 1 billion trees, but what are we doing with the 43 percent that we own? The second thing I would say is that I continue to be concerned about other sorts of messages that the public could get off of this thing. I see this as basically $128 of new money. We are going to take $47 million from another program. We are, it appears to me, starting really only one new thing, and that is the Tree Trust Foundation. All the rest of it is essentially stuff that is already there that we are going to increase. Now that may not quite be accurate, but it seems to me that is the case, and I must tell you though I think the American people say, yeah, let us go plant some more trees, there is going to have to be a much more solid hook and a rationale to do it if your intent is to sustain the effort.

If your intent is to get a single year appropriation for an increase and to declare a legislative victory, that is one thing. That may happen. But if your intent is to sustain the effort, I think the American people are going to need much more than we are going to plant 1 billion trees and be done with it for a year. I think they are going to need a rationale that hooks them in much more than what I see in the existing presentation. So again I thank you very much.

Ms. KEARNEY. Thank you, Senator.

[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the committee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○